

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/4570/P	Janet Gompertz	25/11/2020 14:56:13	COMMNT	Subject: Objection to planning Application 2020/4570/P.

¿ Charlotte Meynell,  
Planning Officer,  
Camden Council.

Dear Ms. Meynell,

Re: Planning Application 2020/4570/P

I write to object in the strongest terms to the proposed development plan at 6, Lindfield Gardens, a building diagonally opposite from me.

The conversion of a single dwelling into a further 9 apartments, (10 apartments in all), amounts to gross overdevelopment and exploitation. The 9 additional dwellings would also place further stress on the already limited parking spaces on our street. The plans make no provisions to extend on-site parking beyond the existing forecourt area which serves the applicant alone.

Objection on the basis that Camden's previous aesthetic landscaping conditions have not been met.

My primary objection to this application however concerns the aesthetics, in this Conservation Area. It is notable that Camden's previous landscaping conditions have not been implemented.

I have lived in Lindfield Gardens for 37 years and I vividly remember how 6, Lindfield Gardens looked prior to 2008, when there was an attractive front terraced garden with numerous trees.

This applicant's last development in 2008 stripped the garden of its trees and greenery and to date they have not been replaced. Instead, we have a concrete and brick front terrace, barren and devoid of any vegetation.

In 2008 Camden Council's Planning Department granted permission, (2008/1373/P), subject to certain soft landscaping conditions to the front elevation. The applicant failed to fulfil these front 'garden' landscaping conditions, and remains in breach of his obligations to Camden, to the environment and to his neighbours.

This building sits uncomfortably and out of harmony with all the other buildings in our street, all of which have attractive front gardens. There are no possibilities within the current planning proposal for this to be appropriately addressed.

Objection on grounds of the applicants previous history

As neighbours we still remember the disruption this applicant's building works caused in 2008 when cement mixers constantly blocked access to our road, with dirt and excessive noise on a daily basis extending over several years.

The applicant showed no consideration for the inconvenience to his neighbours or any concern for the local environment.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>Camden Council's pre- application letter for this current application, states that the applicant should enter into consultation with local residents, his neighbours and the Redfrog Neighbourhood Forum. No such consultation has taken place. This is suggestive, yet again, of the applicant's aggressive disregard for the concern of his neighbours.</p> <p>Scepticism that current Proposals to Landscape the front Terrace could be fulfilled.</p> <p>The Arboricultural report for this current application, 2020/4570/P, states:-</p> <p>"4.3 Opportunities for new tree and shrub planting exist around the site which will be a positive contribution to the landscape now and for the future".</p> <p>Inspection of the front terrace, shows that the planting of trees and shrubs will simply not be possible in the solid concrete and brick structure with its existing 9 roof windows to the swimming pool, below, that was constructed in 2008.</p> <p>I therefore have no faith in the promises made by the applicant to enhance this front elevation, so that it conforms in any way to a front 'garden', with enhancement for biodiversity, as stated in the Refrog Neighbourhood Plan 2020.</p> <p>For all the reasons here stated, I urge Camden to refuse their permission.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Janet Gompertz.</p>

---

**Application No:**      **Consultees Name:**      **Received:**      **Comment:**

2020/4570/P      Usha Malhotra      26/11/2020 10:03:21      OBJ

**Response:**

Charlotte Meynell,  
Planning Officer.

Dear Mrs. Meynell,

Re:- Planning Application 2020/4570/P.

We write to register our objection to this planning application at 6, Lindfield Gardens, to convert a single dwelling into a block of 9 flats.

We notice that this planning application does not include on-site parking, so a further 9 residents parking permits will simply add further pressure to the existing lack of sufficient on street parking spaces.

However, our principle objection relates to our memory of the applicant's previous lack of consideration for the environment or to his neighbours, during his last extensive building project in 2008.

Prior to this, we used to enjoy looking out on to a pleasant garden with trees at No. 6 Lindfield Gardens, opposite our home. The applicant's 2008 building project resulted in 3 trees being felled and the removal of all things living in the front elevation.

We now look out on to a stern concrete and brick terraced development completely void of greenery. The applicant's proposal, (a condition of planning being granted), to restore the soft landscaping in the front, never took place.

Access to our road was constantly blocked and we were forced to endure very noisy and dirty building works that persisted all day, every day for several years. We were unable to relax or enjoy our home. The applicant showed no regard for the effect of his excessive development on us or his other neighbours.

(This was in stark contrast to other large developments that have taken place in our road that have passed without incident and to which we had no objections).

Contrary to the Council's Pre-Planning application letter, which advises the applicant to consult with neighbours and the local Redfrog Neighbourhood Forum, no consultation has taken place.

Our previous, unforgettable, negative experience has undermined our confidence in this applicant's current extensive planning proposal. There is nothing to commend it; it does little to improve the exceptionally unaesthetic front facade, beyond replacing the brown pebble-dash with white render.

In our opinion the applicant is seeking to maximise and exploit the financial development potential of his single dwelling, without regard to the effects on the immediate environment or on his neighbours.

We would ask you to please refuse planning permission.

Yours sincerely,

Usha and Arvind Malhotra.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/4570/P	Elio Stracuzzi	25/11/2020 20:38:36	OBJ	Ms. Meynell, Planning Officer, Camden Council.

Re: Planning Application 2020/4570/P

Dear Ms. Meynell,

I write to object to the above planning application at 6, Lindfield Gardens, which proposes to convert a single dwelling into a block of 9 flats. In my opinion this amounts to excessive exploitation. It also adds a further 9 residents parking permits to an area that already has insufficient parking spaces on the street. The proposed planning application makes no provision for further on-site parking, beyond the existing parking spaces owned by the applicant.

I most strongly object to the plans to develop the roof into an open roof space which will be visible from my home opposite.

The Officer's Pre- application Letter states that the precious erosion of the house's character at ground level should not be used as a precedent to justify destroying its remaining architectural features at the upper and roof levels.

I am also most concerned that this open roof space will encourage partying and noise in an otherwise exceptionally quiet neighbourhood.

Having perused the proposed plans, I am disappointed that they do nothing to improve the unattractive, front facade of the building.

It is out of kilter with all the other front gardens in the road, in that number 6, Lindfield Gardens, has nothing growing in it, so it cannot be called a garden. It is an eyesore.

I understand that the applicant's previous excessive development was conditional upon soft landscaping of the front terrace. This has not taken place so the applicant remains in breach of his obligations to Camden, the environment and to his neighbours. I therefore have no confidence that the proposals in this application to improve the appearance will be delivered. The existing concrete and brick structure will not make planting of trees and shrubs possible.

I therefore ask you to please refuse planning permission.

Yours sincerely,

Elio Stracuzzi

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/4570/P	Janet Gompertz	25/11/2020 15:05:54	OBJ	<p>Subject: Objection to planning Application 2020/4570/P.</p>

¿Charlotte Meynell,  
Planning Officer,  
Camden Council.

Dear Ms. Meynell,

Re: Planning Application 2020/4570/P

I write to object in the strongest terms to the proposed development plan at 6, Lindfield Gardens, a building diagonally opposite from me.

The conversion of a single dwelling into a further 9 apartments, (10 apartments in all), amounts to gross overdevelopment and exploitation. The 9 additional dwellings would also place further stress on the already limited parking spaces on our street. The plans make no provisions to extend on-site parking beyond the existing forecourt area which serves the applicant alone.

Objection on the basis that Camden's previous aesthetic landscaping conditions have not been met.

My primary objection to this application however concerns the aesthetics, in this Conservation Area. It is notable that Camden's previous landscaping conditions have not been implemented.

I have lived in Lindfield Gardens for 37 years and I vividly remember how 6, Lindfield Gardens looked prior to 2008, when there was an attractive front terraced garden with numerous trees.

This applicant's last development in 2008 stripped the garden of its trees and greenery and to date they have not been replaced. Instead, we have a concrete and brick front terrace, barren and devoid of any vegetation.

In 2008 Camden Council's Planning Department granted permission, (2008/1373/P), subject to certain soft landscaping conditions to the front elevation. The applicant failed to fulfil these front 'garden' landscaping conditions, and remains in breach of his obligations to Camden, to the environment and to his neighbours.

This building sits uncomfortably and out of harmony with all the other buildings in our street, all of which have attractive front gardens. There are no possibilities within the current planning proposal for this to be appropriately addressed.

Objection on grounds of the applicants previous history

As neighbours we still remember the disruption this applicant's building works caused in 2008 when cement mixers constantly blocked access to our road, with dirt and excessive noise on a daily basis extending over several years.

The applicant showed no consideration for the inconvenience to his neighbours or any concern for the local environment.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>Camden Council's pre- application letter for this current application, states that the applicant should enter into consultation with local residents, his neighbours and the Redfrog Neighbourhood Forum. No such consultation has taken place. This is suggestive, yet again, of the applicant's aggressive disregard for the concern of his neighbours.</p> <p>Scepticism that current Proposals to Landscape the front Terrace could be fulfilled.</p> <p>The Arboricultural report for this current application, 2020/4570/P, states:-</p> <p>"4.3 Opportunities for new tree and shrub planting exist around the site which will be a positive contribution to the landscape now and for the future".</p> <p>Inspection of the front terrace, shows that the planting of trees and shrubs will simply not be possible in the solid concrete and brick structure with its existing 9 roof windows to the swimming pool, below, that was constructed in 2008.</p> <p>I therefore have no faith in the promises made by the applicant to enhance this front elevation, so that it conforms in any way to a front 'garden', with enhancement for biodiversity, as stated in the Refrog Neighbourhood Plan 2020.</p> <p>For all the reasons here stated, I urge Camden to refuse their permission.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Janet Gompertz.</p> <p>Sent from my iPad</p>