


6 Lindfield Gardens / APPLICANT RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION RESPONSES of 21.12.20

:



C`onsultee/ Objector	Objections/ Comments		Response
Manoj Nair Garden Flat No 11 20/11/2020 Objection	I am writing to object to the above planning application, which proposes to convert No. 6 Lindfield Gardens, currently a single-family dwelling, into a block of nine flats. As you know Lindfield Gardens comes within a conservation area.	1	
	As the owner-occupier of the Garden flat at No. 11 Lindfield Gardens, I am concerned about the impact this development will have on my family's ability to enjoy our home, particularly in terms of additional noise and overlooking.	2	<p>This resident's property is positioned on the other side of the road, but does not directly face the application site</p> <p>It is not possible, given such distances and the set back and elevated height of the application site, that any overlooking could occur to this property.</p> <p>The closet part of the front elevation of No.11 is <u>over 35m from</u> the main front elevation of the application building <u>and 25m from</u> the street level forecourt.</p> <p>Please see a view from the back of pavement edge outside No.11 looking towards the application site. We have also submitted an updated section drawing through the site and the street and through the converted dwelling house opposite to highlight the substantial distances between properties.</p> 
	But above all, we are alarmed by the additional 9 residents parking permits which the residents would have to be provided with. Such a request should have to be turned down under Section 106 which refers to no further parking permits being issued. There are already insufficient parking spaces in our road.	3	<p>No car parking spaces are proposed save for 1 space to be retained for use by the owner.</p> <p>There would be a reduction in available parking spaces, this is a clear highway benefit, not harm.</p> <p>It is fully expected that save for this 1 space (which will demised to the large 3 bed flat) the site would be car free: no off street spaces and no residents permits to be issued in line with Policy T2.</p> <p>An EV charging point can be installed and cycle parking is proposed to meet London Plan standards.</p>
	<p>I also think that there is a lot one can oppose on the grounds of aesthetics, particularly the front facade. The views of the artificial grass terraces with Velux windows above his swimming pool, demonstrate that any promise to further landscape the front will not be possible. Trees cannot be planted in solid concrete!</p> <p>In 2010the same owner, Mr Zaidman, reneged on his tree planting obligations to Camden, to replace the trees he felled during the last development. Etc etc visual impact on the conservation area, thanks to its unsympathetic design and disregard for the Edwardian building's remaining architectural character.</p>	4	<p>A detailed landscape scheme has been submitted for approval by the LPA.</p> <p>Full details can be controlled by condition as can the retention and replacement of such planting.</p> <p>It is clear that the front terrace can be significantly improved, enhancing the character and appearance of the conservation area (which the LPA Audit notes is a very poor part of the conservation area).</p> <p><u>Please also see our comments made at Point No10 in respect of this matter.</u></p>

6 Lindfield Gardens / APPLICANT RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION RESPONSES of 21.12.20



:



	<p>appropriately to comply with the Council's policies and pre-application recommendations.' Even without sight of the initial pre-application drawings, this is demonstrably not the case</p> <p>The Council's Pre-application Advice Letter, dated 14.05.2020, lists numerous grounds for refusal on the basis of damage to the character and historical fabric of this period building in the conservation area.</p> <p>These grounds for refusal have not been addressed in the revised proposal, which continues to contravene the following pre-application advice:</p> <p>1. 'The applicant seeks to justify substantial rear extensions with the desire to achieve symmetry and a more consistent rear building line. However, it is not considered that symmetry equates to a sympathetic design and the proposed extensions overwhelm the rear elevation. Officers note that the property has been extended a number of times in the past and while the historic character of the rear elevation has been lost at ground level, it retains its basic original form on the upper levels, with an intact roofscape and some original window openings. [...]There is scope to extend at ground floor level to the rear, however further upper floor extensions are not recommended.'</p> <p>The current proposal disregards the Officer's comments both about the 'overwhelming' upper floor extensions and the homogenizing symmetry of the proposed design, with its undifferentiated rear line. The original Edwardian house was constructed on an asymmetrical plan, featuring a north wing that advanced further into the rear garden, while the south wing was set further back. (That wing featured a finely detailed decorative bay, which was destroyed by the rear extension granted permission in 2006 [2005/5019/P], pursued by the same applicant.) Meanwhile, the house's roof structure combines three gables of different sizes, heights, and degrees of setback, whose asymmetric interplay of intersecting slopes adds visual interest to the whole.</p> <p>As the Officer states in his pre-application letter, the previous 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.</p> <p>2. 'The proposed extensions are full height on both wings. The original triple-eaves roof form is infilled, creating a monolithic crown roof, completely altering its profile.'</p> <p>In the current proposal, the rear extensions are still full height (that is, two-storey) on both wings, while the south wing's proposed roof extension creates, in effect, a three-storey extension on that side of the house.</p> <p>The present rear elevation above ground level will be more or less entirely masked and/or demolished by these additions. Camden's own design guidance on rear extensions states that 'Extensions that are higher than one full storey below roof eaves/parapet level, or that rise above the general height of neighbouring projections and nearby extensions, will be strongly discouraged. This is because such extensions no longer appears ubordinate to the building.' The visual mass and bulk of the proposed upper-level extensions will increase overshadowing and the sense of enclosure through their additional height, destroying in the process the rear elevation's remaining historical fabric and architectural character.</p> <p>In the current application, drawings of the proposed rear and south-east side elevations make clear just how extensively the roof form is still to be altered, requiring the demolition of a substantial proportion (approaching one third) of the original roof structure. The need to retain this 'intact roofscape' was cited in the pre-application advice as grounds for refusal.</p> <p>3. 'In addition, four sets of glazed patio doors are proposed up all the rear of the house. These are incongruous when sited at a high level and would not be supported.'</p> <p>The four sets of glazed patio doors remain in the current proposal. Three are situated at the first and second-floor levels, despite the Council's indication that their inclusion would not be supported. The two sets of patio doors at the first-floor level provide access to those flats' proposed roof terraces. The second-floor patio doors, belonging to proposed Flat 7, lead onto a flat roof marked 'Maintenance Access Only', though there is nothing indicated on the drawings to prevent this area's use as a terrace.</p>	5	<p>The applicant has made significant and demonstrable changes to the submitted application since the pre-application letter. It is not correct to state that the revised proposal have not sought to address the comments revived at pre-application stage.</p> <p>The applicant has listened to the LPA and has responded positively to many of the points raised by officers.</p> <p>Concerns were raised by officers at pre-app about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>Further upper floor extensions not recommended</i><i>Alterations to front roof pitch and new roof lights</i><i>Size and visibility and amenity issues relating to roof terrace</i><i>The low quality of some of the internal amenity levels of flats, including outlook and aspect at second floor flats and reliance on roof lights.</i> <p>The Planning and Heritage Statement sets out a full and detailed assessment of the proposals and puts this against a formal assessment of the Designated Heritage Asset</p> <p>To the rear the existing building has been heavily altered, in both design and from. Again the range of form and design including the pebble dashed render is uninspiring. The varying size of the gable ends and roof forms behind remain identifiable, but the changes to fenestration (including the large and somehow oversized bay box window) and the cat slide glass central link, means that the rear cannot be seen to display positive characteristics.</p> <p>It is an altered mix of style, extension, and does not provide a cohesive composition. It is a cluttered juxtaposition of the varying accretions and alterations. It does not, (apart from the gable ends, being tied into the frontage) make an obvious or positive contribution to the conservation area.</p> <p>Officers expressed concerns about rearward extensions during pre-application discussions. The applicant has responded by reducing these in scale and mass. There is unquestionably scope for rearward extensions to this property at all floors given the scale of the existing dwelling and the relatively private and enclosed nature of the rear aspect of this plot.</p> <p>A "<i>blanket</i>" presumption against this is not a full assessment. We have listened to officers and we have made reductions. The combination of these reductions and the design changes make these extensions fully acceptable.</p> <p>There is no doubt that the rear of the property is much less sensitive to change than the front which can be widely viewed in the public realm. The rear of the property has a much greater capacity to accommodate change and extensions. Key building lines and the relationship of the built form to the generous garden area is maintained.</p> <p>On the basis of the following key points, there is scope at this property to sustain and accommodate limited rearward extensions to the upper floors. This is a substantial property set in a substantial plot.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>the proposed extensions would not cause any material harm to the character and appearance of any adjacent residential amenity;</i><i>the host building retains its general composition and form;</i><i>the extensions do not harm the conservation area (in this context it would be incorrect for the decision maker to focus solely on the conservation area at the rear of the property, The statutory test is the effect upon the conservation area as a whole not just part of it)</i><i>the rearward extensions would remain subservient the resultant built form and massing would continue to sit comfortably within the site and would remain broadly consistent with adjacent rear building lines.</i> <p>Of course, this rear elevation cannot be viewed by this resident, who would have no visual awareness of the rear aspect of this property. Alterations at the rear, have no effect in the wider public realm.</p> <p>We have provided a further set of contextual drawings that show that relationship of the proposed extensions to the neighbouring buildings, including that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">no ground floor extension extends beyond the existing furthest most rear building linethe first and second flor extension adjacent to No.4 does not project any further rearward than the existing rear building line of No.4there is a 2m rearward extension adjacent to No.8 set at first floor level, but this is set in from the boundary and sites within and below the main height of the gable end.
		6	<p>The rear elevation now provides a much more considered response, ensuring the gables remain dominant.</p> <p>These are not overly large or a discordant series of amendments This is a well ordered new rear elevation, much more cohesive than the existing incongruous additions.</p>
	<p>Rear Terraces</p> <p>The pre-application advice cites the 'noise and disturbance' that would be created by the proposed rear and roof terraces. We are particularly concerned by the two rear terraces at the first-floor level. As the pre-application letter states, 'Each rear terrace would serve a different flat giving the opportunity for occupiers of multiple properties to use these external spaces simultaneously and generate significantly more noise than a single-family household.' The terraces remain in the current proposal, and the concerns raised by the Officer have not been addressed.</p>	7	<p>There are only 2 small rear terraces: These are 6sqm each in size. They are small and proportionate. This might allow a couple of seats and maybe a small table. They are not excessive, they are not communal spaces; they serve a single flat each.</p> <p>The applicant has removed the upper terraces from second floor level which were shown at pre-app stage: we agreed with officer's advice here: Only terraces at first floor remain.</p> <p>There are many example of other terraces, and balconies within the various flat developments and conversions within the street</p> <p>The idea that that these small terraces would become significant noise generators is an over exaggeration in our view.</p>

:



		<p>For example we note that the rear flat in No 11(the block where this consultee lives) : has at least 3 small step out rear terraces. And possibly 2 larger terraces. (although we stand to be corrected on this point)</p> <p>No-one is suggesting that these too are unacceptable noise generators by definition?</p> <div><div><p>3 SMALL STEP OUT TERRACES REAR OF NO 11 2 LARGE REAR TERRACES</p><p>Courtesy Google Maps</p></div><div><p>Courtesy Bing Maps</p></div></div> <p>It is noted that the consultee is "<i>particularly concerned by the two rear terraces at the first-floor level.</i>"</p> <p>There is no-physical or visual or indeed aural relationship here. It would not be possible for the existing residential amenity of this resident to be materially or adversely affected by these proposed rear terraces</p>
<p>Communal Roof Terrace</p> <p>The proposed communal roof terrace has been reduced in size since the pre-application, but at 24m sq is still large enough to 'generate a significant level of noise and disturbance not typical of Lindfield Gardens, a quiet residential street.'</p> <p>As the pre-application advice continues, 'the noise generated could travel relatively long distances in all directions.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Officer states that 'A roof terrace on a new crown roof would be visible, both from the street and in private views, which would be an incongruous feature at high level. The terrace would likely cause more visual harm than is indicated on the submitted drawings due to the potential for the collection of large paraphernalia such as umbrellas and planters associated with its outdoor use.'</p>	<p>8</p>	<p>There is already an existing central roof terrace within this dwelling, albeit hidden behind the front roof pitch.</p> <p>This proposed central terrace is another space to complement and add to the full range of amenity space. There is no real possibility of all 9 units simultaneously trying to use this terrace given that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>The large 3 bed unit has a private garden, indoor pool and front terrace</i>• <i>the four ground units have their own private defensible terrace space.</i>• <i>The first floor rear flats have small terraces,</i>• <i>and all flats can use the communal rear garden space.</i>• <i>This communal roof space is NOT THE SOLE area of amenity space</i> <p>We consider that when officers commented upon the overall effects of a roof terrace in this streetscape within their pre-app response an assumption was reached about visibility, which we trust can now be fully assessed with the benefit of the full formal planning submission and the full set of drawings.</p> <p>Front facing balconies and terraces are common in the street, <u>including the front facing roof terrace next door at No.4a approved by the LPA</u>, at a lower level and which is far more visible. There is no suggestion that these are unacceptable noise generators by definition within the street.</p> <p>The proposed roof terrace is set back well within the site / roof form and will not be visible from within the street. This feature has been reduced in size (almost halved in size) since the pre-application proposal.</p> <p>There is no possibility of any overlooking to No.8 given that the terrace sits a considerable way below the ridge line of the dual pitched roof that runs along the north west side of the dwelling facing the boundary to No.8. The roof terrace could not be visible from No.8</p>

6 Lindfield Gardens / APPLICANT RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION RESPONSES of 21.12.20

:



		<p>This sits within the site behind the ridge line adjacent to No.4a. It is not sat close to the boundary to No.4a. The glass balustrade prevents residents coming close to the ridge line. In any event the roof terrace sits above the height of the front roof terrace to No.4a. This relationship as well as the dormer window and chimney arrangements would not permit overlooking from the roof terrace.</p> <p>The forward clear balustrade of the communal roof terrace is set back considerable distance (4.5m from the front elevation)into the roofscape behind the front pitches and will not be seen from street level. The roof terrace is set back a full 17 m from the back of pavement edge. It is a full 41m from the front elevation of No.11. These are very substantial distances.</p> <p>No 6 also sits much higher that the buildings on the opposite side of the road. The roof terrace will be higher. In this arrangement and at these distances there can be no realistic prospect of harmful overlooking.</p>
	<p>Main Entrance at Side of Property</p> <p>The main entrance for eight out of the nine flats has been relocated to the side of the property adjacent to 8 Lindfield Gardens, tucked away at the end of a narrow passageway where the property's service entrance is currently located.</p> <p>It seems inappropriate to block off that house's present grand main entrance (even if maintained as a dummy door), so as to cram in another studio flat.</p> <p>As a result, the foot traffic associated with eight flats will be directed into the narrow side passageway, where it will cause disturbance and noise to the residents of No. 8. The resulting constricted communal entrance hall is extremely small to serve the residents of eight flats, while its narrowness could cause difficulties with safe evacuation in the event of a fire.</p>	<p>9</p> <p>There are any number of properties in terms of dwelling houses, purpose build flats, converted houses in this street, including flat blocks that have side or off center principal entrances.</p> <p>This resident lives in a converted house with a main side entrance. but with a more modern side addition to the northern elevation to create this entrance</p> <p>The existing building is being retained: this means the main principal front entrance door will remain: the development will clearly retain the typology of a detached dwelling house, which has been one of the key objectives of this application.</p> <p>The footfall associated with 8 flats (the large flat is accessed from street level) is no different to any other modestly sized flat block, including that within which this resident lives. 3 of the units area studios so these units are single persons only.</p> <p>These are not significant numbers, nor is a single point of access an uncommon arrangement for any number of the converted flats in the street.</p> <p>Moreover and very importantly, NONE of the windows at ground floor within the side facing elevation of No.8 serve any <u>habitable</u> rooms. The large ground floor window serves the entrance lobby. It is obscure glazed.</p>  <p>Other windows are positioned further back along the elevation and there are no other ground floor windows overlooking this access route. There is a brick boundary wall between the two properties.</p> <p>We believe there to be 1 bedroom at first floor here, but no other rooms facing the side access way of No 6 in proximity to the entrance door.</p> <p>All residents to No.8 have to pass immediately adjacent to the front bedroom at the ground floor front flat to No.8. These passing routes are nothing uncommon and do not give rise to the level of harm and disturbance that the objector suggests.</p> <p>Our Planning and Heritage Statement sets out these relationships in detail. We have also provided a separate note in respect of this matter.</p>

6 Lindfield Gardens / APPLICANT RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION RESPONSES of 21.12.20

:



	<p>Front Elevation</p> <p>The developer’s Design and Access Statement states that ‘The existing front elevation landscaping to the staggered brick framed panels is of poor quality creating an unsightly appearance for the conservation area. The proposed landscape alterations would substantially enhance the appearance of the property by improved boundary treatment and greater use of greenery.’</p> <p>We agree that the present basement extension frontage is an eyesore that significantly detracts from the Conservation Area and would welcome any planting scheme that would hide it. However, we share the Planning Officer’s skepticism as to whether the proposed landscaping would, in fact, ‘significantly contribute to enhancing the appearance of the property’.</p> <p>In fact, the attached landscape design by Jonathan Snow Design simply reiterates, in its projected overall effect of masking and softening the concrete/brickwork, that proposed in 2008/1373/P when the basement extension was originally granted planning permission.</p> <p>In other words, the applicant is simply proposing, at long last, to implement the type of planting mandated as a condition of that permission – a condition they continue to stand in breach of.</p>	10	<p>The resident’s comments relating to the poor visual aesthetic is noted. We propose a holistic planting scheme to improve and restore the appearance of this structure. A fully detailed landscape scheme has been submitted for approval by the LPA.</p> <p>Full details can be controlled by condition as can the retention and replacement of such planting. It is perfectly clear that the front terrace can be enhanced, thus enhancing the character and appearance of the conservation area (which the Audit notes is a very poor part of the conservation area).</p> <p>This terrace exists as a matter of fact: it was lawfully granted planning permission by the LPA. The fact that local residents consider this an unattractive presence is not surprising and is a view that we share.</p> <p>We are looking to improve this. Doing nothing would be a waste. The planting plan clearly shows that an acceptable visual and planting solution can be provided.</p> <p>The resident states: “<i>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.</i>”</p> <p>We agree with the objector that the existing building is of poor visual quality. However, the notion that this cannot be improved upon is not correct.</p> <p>The works to improve the external appearance of the eating building, will clearly be of benefit over the existing appearance (a fact that is actually cited within the CA Audit itself)</p> <p>The planning officer’s “<i>scepticism</i>” was unfounded in our view, and made without seeing any landscape proposals at pre-app stage, and made without input from a specialist tree or landscape officer. There is no basis for “<i>scepticism</i>” on the basis of information not being provided in full detail at pre-app stage. Full details are now provided, to enable officers to properly and objectively assess these proposals, now, in a formal sense. The fact that the LPA publically shares comments from pre-app stage does not add any weight to the objections that then arise as a result of the publication of such comments made without the benefit of details being provided.</p> <p>All matters relating to construction can be properly controlled by a <u>Construction Traffic Management Plan</u>. Subject to these controls, none of the objections on these grounds hold any weight in planning terms. We note that a CTMP is not normally required by “minor” development such as this.</p> <p>Any objection on the grounds of the applicants “<i>history</i>” are not material subject to comments made above to secure a CTMP and the planting improvements</p>
	<p>Quality of Accommodation</p> <p>While recognizing the need for new homes in the area, we are concerned about the density of the proposed accommodation. The current plan appears to compromise the quality of these new dwellings at the expense of cramming in more units than the space can accommodate. The pre-application advice letter expressed concerns as to whether the smaller proposed units would fully comply with all space standards, concluding that the ‘quality of accommodation for some flats would be substandard’. Some of those concerns remain in the current proposal. It is still unclear, for example, whether the second-floor units would meet the 2.3m minimum ceiling height across 75% of their Gross Internal Area, since only the ‘1.5m height line’ has been marked on the drawings where the floor space is extensively tucked under the eaves.</p> <p>Consultation with Neighbours</p> <p>The Council’s pre-application letter concludes by advising the applicant to ‘enter into consultation with local residents and the Redington Frogna! Neighbourhood Forum at this stage, in order to fully understand and address their concerns before an application is made.’ No such consultation has occurred. This suggests the developer’s aggressive disregard for the concerns of neighbours, and unwillingness to work towards a mutually agreeable outcome. We ask that the Council refuse permission for the reasons above.</p>	11	<p>These are not new build flats. This is an existing building that is being converted. The wholesale demolition of the building has previously been deemed inappropriate by the LPA citing the affect upon the character and appearance of the conservation area.</p> <p>If the principle of new flats is acceptable then they must be accommodated within the fixed parameters of the existing envelope (as extended)</p> <p>The proposed dwellings meets the Nationally Described Space Standards and thus would provide an appropriate standard of accommodation for future occupiers. This is set out fully within the accompanying Planning and Heritage Statement.</p> <p>There is no reason therefore to consider that that these are cramped flats. In addition, all have a very high quality of external amenity space.</p> <p>The applicant also sets out fully, how significant amendments to layout and arrangement have been made following the comments made by officer’s helpful comments at pre-app stage.</p> <p>Many of the officer’s comments were reasonable and clear. This resulted in changes that significantly improved the amenity between the flats and the quality of the accommodation in terms of outlook and light for example.</p> <p>Again, full details of the accommodation changes are set out within the Planning and Heritage Statement.</p>

6 Lindfield Gardens / APPLICANT RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION RESPONSES of 21.12.20

:



<div>Lidia Tyszczuk</div> <div>Flat 2, No 8</div> <div>OBJECTION</div>	<p>As a resident living next door to this proposed development at Flat 2, 8 Lindfield Gardens, I totally OBJECT to this planning application on the following grounds:</p> <p>LIGHT POLLUTION & LACK OF PRIVACY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Severe light pollution & lack of privacy from Flat 4's proposed living area with side windows & large patio doors leading onto a balcony. The proposed side windows alone will spill light directly onto my balcony & into my living space. Equally Flat 4 will have direct views on to my balcony at Flat 2, 8 Lindfield Gardens & vice versa, which is totally unacceptable for both parties. <p>My privacy will be further marred as my balcony will also be very easily observed from the terrace of Flat 4.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">One of the main reasons I bought my property is because of the unique open beautiful garden views I look onto, unmarred by light pollution from surrounding buildings or street lights, giving one the feeling of living in the country. The new proposal will also increase the glazed areas to the ground floor rear elevation by @ 25%, adding to the major light spillage problem.	12	<p>The proposed windows within the side north west elevation are already half frosted. These could be increased to full height obscured glazing if deemed necessary by officers and secured by condition. Flat 4 continues to be served by the rear facing windows onto the step out terrace.</p> <p>There is no direct overlooking of any habitable window within No.8 as a result of these side windows.</p> <p>The domestic light of a single room will not in our view ,cause any notable or under sense of light pollution to any habitable windows. There are already windows with the side elevation of both properties.</p> <p>We note that the consultee has commented that the current arrangement gives one the <i>"feeling of living in the country"</i></p> <p>We very respectfully note that it is entirely reasonable that new development should not give rise to material or demonstrable harm to any neighbours amenity, but equally this is a location within zone 2 of our capital city, and it is a well-established planning principle that residents in such locations may not be able to enjoy the fullest level of amenity as one might expect living in a rural or village environment for example.</p>
	<p>NOISE & DISTURBANCE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">The inevitable increased noise level of having 8 extra households living next door-especially as the proposal is to include a communal roof terrace & communal rear balconies that will encourage noisy group outside entertaining, destroying privacy & tranquillity. <p>This 'noise & disturbance' pre-application concern raised by the Officer by these proposed outside areas appears still not to have been addressed.</p>	13	<p>Please see our comments in respect of this matter at:</p> <div><div>-Rear terraces</div><div>Point No. 7</div></div> <div><div>-Roof terrace</div><div>Point No.8</div></div> <div><div>-Side entrance</div><div>Point No.9</div></div> <p>The idea that new flats by definition will <i>"encourage noisy group outside entertaining, destroying privacy & tranquillity."</i> is an over-exaggeration.</p> <p>It is no different to a group of residents having the ability to hold a barbecue or a gathering in a communal garden, including a communal garden such as for the flats at No.8, or perhaps on the existing rear balcony of No.8 . There is no difference in the expected use of such spaces compared to the existing neighbours spaces.</p>
	<p>HIGH DENSITY ACCOMMODATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">No.6 is one of the last remaining family single dwelling homes on the street & it should be preserved & remain as such.The proposed disproportionate high density accommodation at no.6 totally compromises people's living conditions & quality of life & this is particularly relevant to the smaller proposed units. <p>Whilst wishing to provide new homes in Camden, these cramped units simply cannot be passed off as 'affordable housing' in one of the most affluent areas in London?!</p>	14	<p>As the resident notes, the predominate dwelling typology is not large single dwelling houses, but flat blocks and converted houses.</p> <p>The resident objects to the conversion of this dwelling house to a flatted development which is consistent and compatible to the prevailing character of the area and which follows the same form of their own home within a converted dwelling house</p> <p>This is not high density accommodation at all, but reflective of the character and typology of the street.</p> <p>The applicant is not looking to <i>"pass"</i> the units as <i>"affordable houses"</i> in <i>"in one of the most affluent areas in London?!"</i>. No such mention has ever been suggested . These are owner occupied private flats all with a very high standard of internal and external amenity.</p> <p>Please see our comments in respect of this matter at Point No.11 above</p>
	<p>DESIGN</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">The rear extension of Flat 4 will obstruct my current open views of 6 Lindfield Gardens & beyond. The sun also rises from this easterly direction, so morning sunlight into my property will be significantly compromised.The massing of the extension is out of character with the existing building & the proposals seek to exaggerate an already undesirable solution, where the building line is protruding significantly beyond the building line of the 2 neighbouring properties. Would this therefore set a precedent to extend our building to their new building line?	15	<p>Please see our comments made at Points 5 & 6 above and Point 34 below</p> <p>The existing rear gable form of the building where it is adjacent to No.8 remains the same. The ridge line and eaves at second floor remain the same. The upper floor outline of the gable end remains the same. There is no extension at second floor level here.</p> <p>A modest 2m push out extension proposed at first floor. This sits below the eave heights to the existing second floor gable end, given that this sis set back from the site boundary and the distance to the nearest part of No.8 we do not agree that this would cause any harmful effect to the amenity of any rear facing flat in No.8 This consultee has a number of windows that look directly along the rear length of the garden of at 90 degrees to the application site and not obliquely onto No.6.</p> <p>We also note the current live planning application at No.8. Officers appear to have expressed support for this ground floor extension at pre-application stage. Our contextual drawings also show the perfectly acceptable and complementary relationship between the existing rear building line of No.8 and the proposed rear building line of No.8</p>

6 Lindfield Gardens / APPLICANT RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION RESPONSES of 21.12.20

:



	<p>POSITION OF MAIN ENTRANCE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The position of the main entrance for ALL the apartments is on the side of the property (currently the service entrance), adjacent to 8 Lindfield Gdns & hence not in keeping with the character of the other houses in the conservation area which are at the front. <p>All the pedestrian traffic into the building will run along no.8's side of the property causing constant noise & disturbance to the residents of no.8. An entrance way in the centre of the front elevation is more appropriate & will result in significantly less disturbance.</p> <p>Indeed they have made the current grand entrance way completely redundant (proposed to be blocked off) & unusable, which would appear to be contrary to the policies of the conservation area.</p> <p>Why would you destroy the natural flow of a building & simply keep a mock front door?!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The side entrance also only appears to be 600mm wide at its tightest point which is substandard & not an acceptable amenity for the inhabitants.• Do the proposals fully consider the fire risks of having all 8 flats using one narrow single route to exit? Could you please forward the proposed fire strategy to me?	16	<p>Please see our comments in respect of this matter at Point No.9 above.</p>
REDINGTON FROGNAL NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM	<p>In considering this application, it should be noted that the special architectural or historic interest of the Redington Frognal Conservation Area is fundamentally about its garden suburb features, including trees, landscape and gardens and it is therefore paramount importance that gardens are preserved and enhanced.</p> <p>By the time this planning application is considered, examination of the Redington Frognal Neighbourhood Plan (RedFrog NP) is likely to have been completed and it will therefore carry considerable weight</p>	17	<p>The RedFrog MP has not yet been adopted. It has little or no weight at this time. There is no referendum date set yet.</p> <p>The policies of the NP will be in accordance with the adopted Local plan in terms of design, so we see no real effect upon the principle of the proposals here, and the key principles of design assessment will be as per the Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan</p>
	<p>The Neighbourhood Forum agrees with Camden's pre-application advice in respect of the need to green the front of the building and install timber window frames. The Forum would also wish to see all of the advice provided by Camden incorporated, eg substantial reductions to the size and bulk and massing of the proposed rear extensions.</p>	18	<p>In line with the NF comments, the rear extensions have indeed been reduced since the pre-application phase. The Planning and Heritage Statement sets this out.</p> <p>Please see our comments made at Points 5 & 6 above and Point 34 below</p> <p>We are pleased that the NF welcome the enhancements to the front terrace area and the improvements to the front elevation</p>
	<p>The overlooking, noise and loss of privacy as a result of the many roof terraces would have a serious harmful impact on the amenity of the various flats and on neighbouring properties.</p>	19	<p>Please see our comments in respect of this matter at:</p> <div><div>-Rear terraces</div><div>Point No. 7</div><div>-Roof terrace</div><div>Point No.8</div><div>-Side entrance</div><div>Point No.9</div></div>
	<p>We also note the considerable loss of garden that has occurred as a result of the very large garden building of 70 square metres beneath the rear garden tree corridor. This loss of valuable garden space is in clear conflict with both RedFrog NP policy SD 1 and the Redington Frognal Conservation Area appraisals (2003 and the current draft). The proposed rear extensions would represent an additional and unacceptable loss of garden.</p>	20	<p>The "loss" of the garden area by way of the existing garden room is not material to this application, given the proposals for amenity space made within this application.</p> <p>The existing garden is very large indeed by any reasonable assessment. It is currently approximately 42m long and 17m wide.(714sqm) even with the built form of the garden house this is a very large garden area.</p> <p>The rear ground floor extensions are modest: to suggest that this results in a significant loss of garden space is not correct. The rear extensions DO NOT project any further to the rear than the existing furthest rear building line. These extensions project to a maximum 4m.</p> <p>The existing garden overall dimensions remain the same, there is no development within the main garden areas. This does not affect the urban grain or the spatial arrangement of the plot within the conservation area. The plot is still recognisable as a large domestic garden. A landscaping scheme can be proposed for these areas if required.</p>

6 Lindfield Gardens / APPLICANT RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION RESPONSES of 21.12.20

:



Janet Gompertz Lives “diagonally opposite”	<p>By the time the application is considered, the RedFrog NP will have been examined and the policies will therefore carry considerable weight. Some of the policies of particular relevance are highlighted below. A substantial biodiversity gain should be provided.</p> <p>RedFrog NP policy: SD 1</p> <p>Development should achieve a biodiversity net gain and maximise the area of soft, natural landscaping, to act as a carbon sink and help mitigate climate change and the urban heat island effect.</p> <p>Measures to achieve a biodiversity net gain include the incorporation of eaves and spaces for internal bat roosts, and the use of bird bricks and other features to support wildlife, along with tree and hedge planting.</p>	21	<p>In terms of biodiversity, we would be happy to provide for bat and bird box installations. These matters can be secured by condition.</p> <p>The proposed planting to the front terrace will not only provide a significant visual benefit, but can also provide a clear biodiversity net gain.</p>
	<p>RedFrog NP policy: BGI 2</p> <p>This policy notes that landscaping proposals should include tree planting, with species selected on the basis of local character, high biodiversity value and / or high value to insects. Opportunity should also be taken to create, strengthen and restore tree lines and biodiversity corridors, reducing the incidents of breaks and the length of gaps.</p> <p>By incorporating such additional trees, this will help with shading and cooling and reduce the potential for surface water flooding downstream, due to the loss of natural soft surface caused by the proposed development.</p>		
	<p>Car-free development</p> <p>Both the Camden Local Plan and Redington FrognaI Neighbourhood Plan require new development to be car-free:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Camden policies: T1, T2 and CC4RedFrog NP policy: SD 3	22	<p>In terms of car free development. We refer to our comments made above at Point No.3</p> <p>The development will be car free in accordance with Policy T2.</p>
	<p>Surface water flooding</p> <p>Redington FrognaI, and the area downstream (eg Lymington Road), are prone to surface water flooding and developers are asked to consult Thames Water’s pre-application service at https://www.thameswater.co.uk/preplanning</p> <p>The surface water flood risk is shown below.</p>		
	<p>I write to object in the strongest terms to the proposed development plan at 6, Lindfield Gardens, a building diagonally opposite from me.</p> <p>The conversion of a single dwelling into a further 9 apartments, (10 apartments in all), amounts to gross overdevelopment and exploitation.</p>	23	<p>There are 8 additional units, (9 in total) not 10 as suggested</p> <p>In terms of car free development. We refer to our comments made above at Point No.3</p> <p>The development will be car free in accordance with Policy T2.</p>

6 Lindfield Gardens / APPLICANT RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION RESPONSES of 21.12.20

:




OBJECTION	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p><i>Objection on grounds of the applicants previous history</i></p> <p>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.</p> <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.</p> <p>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:- "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. For all the reasons here stated, I urge Camden to refuse their permission.</p>	24	<p>The resident's comments relating to the poor visual aesthetic is noted. We propose to a holistic planting scheme to significantly improve and restore the appearance of this structure. A fully detailed landscape scheme has been submitted for approval by the LPA.</p> <p>Full details can be controlled by condition as can the retention and replacement of such planting. It is perfectly clear that the front terrace can be enhanced, thus enhancing the character and appearance of the conservation area (which the Audit notes is a very poor part of the conservation area).</p> <p>This terrace exists as a matter of fact: it was lawfully granted planning permission by the LPA. The fact that local residents consider this an unattractive presence is noyt surprising and is a view that we share.</p> <p>We are looking to improve this. Doing nothing would be a waste. The planting plan clearly shows that an acceptable visual and planting solution can be provided.</p> <p>The resident states: "<i>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.</i>"</p> <p>We agree with the objector that the existing building is of poor visual quality. However, the notion that this cannot be improved upon is clearly incorrect.</p> <p>The works to improve the external appearance of the eating building, will clearly be of benefit over the existing appearance (a fact that is actually cited within the CA Audit itself)</p> <p>The planning officer's "<i>scepticism</i>" was unfounded in our view and made without seeing any landscape proposals at pre-app stage, and made without input from a specialist tree of landscape officer. There is no basis for "<i>scepticism</i>" on the basis of information not being provided in full detail at pre-app stage. Full details are now provided, to enable officers to properly and objectively assess these proposals, now, in a formal sense. The fact that the LPA publically shares comments from pre-app stage does not add any weight to the objections that then arise as a result of the publication of such comments made without the benefit of details being provided.</p> <p>All matters relating to construction can be properly controlled in the normal manner by a <u>Construction Traffic Management Plan</u>. Subject to these controls, none of the objections on these grounds hold any weight in planning terms.</p> <p>Any objection on the grounds of the applicants "<i>history</i>" are not material subject to comments made above to secure a CTMP and the planting improvements</p>
	<p>Usha Malhotra</p> <p>OBJECTION</p> <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.</p> <p>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.</p>	25	<p>In terms of car free development. We refer to our comments made above at Point No.3</p> <p>The development will be car free in accordance with Policy T2.</p>
	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	26	<p>This resident's notes that "<i>our principle objection relates to our memory of the applicant's previous lack of consideration</i>" in respect of construction management problems on this site some 12 or so years ago. This is not a material planning objection to these current development proposals before the LPA for determination.</p> <p>Please see out comments in respect of this matter made at Point No.24 above.</p>

6 Lindfield Gardens / APPLICANT RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION RESPONSES of 21.12.20

:



	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>		
Elio Stracuzzi Flat 8 No 11 OBJECTION	<p>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.</p>	27	<p>It is simply incorrect to state this amounts to "<i>excessive exploitation</i>"._We are looking to provide much need new homes in a residential street which is predominantly in flatted form.</p> <p>The resident objects to the conversion of this dwelling house to a flatted development which is consistent and compatible to the prevailing character of the area, and is the same type of accommodation that this consultee resides within.</p> <p>This is not high density accommodation at all, but reflective of the character and typology of the street.</p>
	<p>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.</p>	28	<p>In terms of car free development. We refer to our comments made above at Point No.3</p> <p>The development will be car free in accordance with Policy T2.</p>
	<p>I most strongly object to the plans to develop the roof into an open roof space which will be visible from my home opposite.</p>	29	<p>Please see our comments in respect of this matter made above at Point No.8</p> <p>Visibility does not equate to harm. This front closest part of this objectors flat building is at approximately 45m from the point of the roof terrace. We question the ability to view the glass balustrade from this property</p> <p>This is the view from outside No11. The roof terrace glass balustrade will not be visible. This resident lives diagonally (not directly) opposite the application site.</p> 
	<p>The Officer s Pre- application Letter states that the precious erosion of the houses character at ground level should not be used as a precedent to justify destroying its remaining architectural features at the upper and roof levels.¿</p>	30	<p>This application does not in any way "<i>destroy</i>" the remaining features of the dwelling either within the front or rear elevation. To suggest that this application makes such interventions is clearly not the case, given the much reduced intervention proposed by this application,</p> <p>The rear elevation of the existing house is a poor jumble of style/ form and design and is highly compromised in design terms.</p>
	<p>I am also most concerned that this open roof space will encourage partying and noise in an otherwise exceptionally quiet neighbourhood.</p>	31	<p>Please see our comments in respect of this matter at:</p>

6 Lindfield Gardens / APPLICANT RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION RESPONSES of 21.12.20

:



		<div><div>-Rear terraces Point No. 7</div><div>-Roof terrace Point No.8</div><div>-</div></div> <p>The idea that new flats by definition will “ <i>encourage partying and noise in an otherwise exceptionally quiet neighbourhood.</i>” is an over-exaggeration</p> <p>It is no different to a group of residents having the ability to hold a barbecue or a gathering in a communal garden, including a communal garden such as for the flats at No.8, or perhaps on the existing rear balcony of No.8 . There is no difference in the expected use of such spaces compared to the existing neighbours spaces.</p> <p>There is simply no evidence to suggest otherwise</p> <p>This arrangement in no different to the range of communal gardens, private terraces/ balconies and steps outs that exiting in many of these properties, including the within the rear aspect of this resident's own flat block, although it is noted that this resident may well be within flat with no such features given that it faces the street,</p>
	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The existing concrete and brick structure will not make planting of trees and shrubs possible.¿ I therefore ask you to please refuse planning permission.¿</p>	<div>32</div> <p>It is agreed that as existing this is an unattractive building. Even the Council's own CA Audit notes this is a poor area of the conservation area.</p> <p>It is clearly not correct for the residents to state the proposals “<i>do nothing to improve the unattractive. front facade of the building.</i>”</p> <p>We are looking to provide a clear and obvious enhancement to the appearance of the main dwelling, to remedy the unsightly windows and the bland, dull pebble dash.</p> <p>This application proposes visual enhancements to the main elevation. These are clearly shown on the submitted plans. and can only (with a reasonable assessment) be classed as an enhancement over the existing.</p>

KATE COLLERAN

top floor No.8

I am writing to object to the above planning application to convert the existing family dwelling into a block of nine flats.

I am freeholder of 8 Lindfield Gardens and leaseholder of flat 5 (top floor) in the same building. I also have over ██████████ association with Lindfield Gardens, familiar with its character and its history and with the various developments and changes in the street.

I am concerned about the considerable impact of the proposed development, its unsympathetic design, a disregard for the building’s remaining architecture character and for the virtual destruction of a long established garden. The plans impinge on the privacy of several leaseholders by overlooking and the considerable noise pollution would affect all leaseholders.

My objections are also framed by NPPF D1n, that states that developments should ‘*improve the character and quality of an area and the way it functions*’ and that it *should avoid having an ‘impact upon the amenity and character of an area’ (NPPFD 1 7.20).*

I also refer to the rest of the above guidelines, namely that, ‘*The Council will resist development that occupies an excessive part of a garden and where there is a loss of garden space which contributes to the character of the townscape*’.

33

The resident lives in a flat within a converted former detached dwelling house, which is the same type of accommodation proposed by this application.

It is inaccurate to suggest that the proposal result in the “*virtual destruction*” of the rear garden area.: There is no excessive development or creation of new built form within the garden. This is not garden grabbing or backland development as the NPPF sets out and which is not cited in the correct context in this objection.

The existing garden is very large by any reasonable assessment. It is currently approximately 42m long and 17m wide.(714sqm) even with the built form of the garden house this is a very large garden area.

The rear ground floor extensions are modest to suggests that this results in a significant loss of garden space is not correct. The rear extensions DO NOT project any further to the rear that the existing furthest rear building line. These extensions project to a maximum 4m.

The existing garden overall dimensions remain the same, there is no development within the main garden areas. This does not affect the urban grain or the spatial arrangement of the plot within the conservation area. The plot is still recognisable as a large domestic garden. A landscaping scheme can be proposed for these areas if required.

6 Lindfield Gardens / APPLICANT RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION RESPONSES of 21.12.20

:



	<p><u>Design</u></p> <p>The applicant states that ‘all comments and issues raised have been addressed appropriately to comply with the Council’s policies....’ Regrettably this is not the case. The Council’s Pre-application letter of 14 May 2020 listed several ground for refusal on the basis of damage to the character and historical fabric of this period house in a conservation area.</p> <p><i>1. ‘The applicant seeks to justify substantial rear extensions with the desire to achieve symmetry and a more consistent rear building line. However, it is not considered that symmetry equates to a sympathetic design and the proposed extensions overwhelm the rear elevation. Officers note that the property has been extended a number of times in the past and while the historic character of the rear elevation has been lost at ground level, it retains its basic original form on the upper levels, with an intact roof scape and some original window openings. [...] There is scope to extend at ground floor level to the rear, however further upper floor extensions are not recommended.’</i></p> <p>The current proposal disregards the Officer’s comments both about the ‘overwhelming’ upper floor extensions and the homogenising symmetry of the proposed design, with its undifferentiated rear line. The original Edwardian house was constructed on an asymmetrical plan, featuring a north wing that advanced further into the rear garden, while the south wing was set further back. (That wing featured a finely detailed decorative bay, which was destroyed by the rear extension granted permission in 2006 [2005/5019/P], pursued by the same applicant.) Meanwhile, the house’s roof structure combines three gables of different sizes, heights and degrees of setback, whose asymmetric interplay of intersecting slopes adds visual interest to the whole.</p> <p>As the Officer states in his pre-application letter, the previous 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.</p> <p><i>2. ‘The proposed extensions are full height on both wings. The original triple-eaves roof form is infilled, creating a monolithic crown roof, completely altering its profile.’</i></p> <p>In the current proposal, the rear extensions are still full height (that is, two-storey) on both wings; while the south wing’s proposed roof extension creates, in effect, a three-storey extension on that side of the house. The present rear elevation above ground level will be more or less entirely masked and/or demolished by these additions.</p> <p>Camden’s own design guidance on rear extensions states that, ‘<i>Extensions that are higher than one full storey below roof eaves/parapet level, or that rise above the general height of neighbouring projections and nearby extensions, will be strongly discouraged. This is because such extensions no longer appear subordinate to the building.</i>’ The visual mass and bulk of the proposed upper-level extensions will increase overshadowing and the sense of enclosure through their additional height, destroying in the process the rear elevation’s remaining historical fabric and architectural character.</p>	<p>34</p> <p>Please see our comments made at Point 5 and 6 above.</p> <p>The applicant stresses that these are not major or substantial extensions to the rear of No.8.</p> <p>The Planning and Heritage Statement sets out a full and critical assessment as to the poor visible anatomy of the existing rear elevation. These are not overwhelming extensions rather subservient and well placed areas of new extension.</p> <p>They have been reduced in scale and depth from the original pre-application proposals.</p> <p>There is a benefit to No.8, in that the existing single storey wooden extension is being removed and the replacement extension being set in off and away from the boundary to No.8</p> <p>No ground floor extension extends further to the rear to any greater death than this existing rear wooden extension. The ground floor extensions will have no effect or impact upon amenity to either of the neighbouring properties whatsoever.</p> <p>We have submitted a further set of contextual drawings that show the existing and proposed layouts in full context to the neighbouring properties including the rear building lines.</p> <p>We also note the current live planning application at No.8. Officers appear to have expressed support for this ground floor extension at pre-application stage. Our contextual drawings also show the perfectly acceptable and complementary relationship between the existing rear building line of No.8 and the proposed rear building line of No.8</p> <p>The existing rear gable form of the building where it is adjacent to No.8 remains the same. The ridge line and eaves at second floor remain the same. The upper floor outline of the gable end remains the same. There is no extension at second floor level here.</p> <p>A modest 2m push out extension proposed at first floor. This sits below the eave heights to the existing second floor gable end, given that this sis set back from the site boundary and the distance to the nearest part of No.8 we do not agree that this would cause any harmful effect to the amenity of any rear facing flat in No.8 This consultee resides at the top floor, therefore they will effective sit well above the height of the first floor extension. The rear windows look along the garden and not obliquely onto No.6.</p> <p>Adjacent to No.4, no part of the first floor extension projects beyond the rear building line of No.4. The first floor is then covered by an extension of the existing gable end. Again, no part of this extension projects beyond the rear building line of No.4. On this basis the extensions are well proportioned and have regard to the neighbouring context.</p> <p>The design of the application is of a lesser scale than the pre-app. It is also now asymmetric in terms of building line and form. The key ridge and eve heights remain at the same heights. The rear elevation retains the linkages to the gable and ridge lines, which are the only real discernible features of note.</p> <p>These doors are not large bi-fold doors, but rather they are well proposed doors that provide step our rear access at first floor. They are positioned comfortably within the gable ends, so that there is an acceptable ratio of solid to void here. They are capped by a brick lintel. These are not UPVC patio doors.</p> <p>These doors are no different as a principle for example than the 2 sets of doors windows, half side lights, and a fan light window that serve open onto the rear first floor balcony of No.8. They are not visible within the public realm, not visible from within the rear facing rooms of No.4 or No.8 and will only be partially be visible when residents are stood in their own gardens looking back onto the rear of No.6. Even then, residents of No.8 will only see them marginally and fleetingly through the dense boundary planting between the gardens.</p> <p>It is not correct to state that there is substantial demolition of the roof required. The key ridge lines/ roof pitches and gable ends remain as existing. Sone internal lengths of pitch will be removed in part to accommodate the second floor level space, but not up to the ridge height.</p>
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

6 Lindfield Gardens / APPLICANT RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION RESPONSES of 21.12.20

:



	<p>In the current application, drawings of the proposed rear and south-east side elevations make clear just how extensively the roof form is still to be altered, requiring the demolition of a substantial proportion (approaching one third) of the original roof structure. The need to retain this 'intact roof scape' was cited in the pre-application advice as grounds for refusal.</p> <p><i>3. 'In addition, four sets of glazed patio doors are proposed up all the rear of the house. These are incongruous when sited at high level and would not be supported.'</i></p> <p>The four sets of glazed patio doors remain in the current proposal. Three are situated at first and second-floor level, despite the Council's indication that <u>their inclusion would not be supported</u>. The two sets of patio doors at first-floor level provide access to those flats' proposed roof terraces. The second-floor patio doors, belonging to proposed Flat 7, lead onto a flat roof marked 'Maintenance Access Only', though there is nothing indicated on the drawings to prevent this area's use as a terrace.</p> <p><u>Privacy</u> The upper-level windows on the proposed north-west elevation directly overlook the garden of Flat 1 and the balcony of Flat 2, 8 Lindfield Gardens. Anyone standing on the first-floor balcony and looking out from the top floor flat of no 8 on the other hand, would be able to look directly into the rooms at the same level, including the unfrosted bedroom windows of the proposed Flat 4. None of these issues have been addressed</p>		
	<p><u>Rear Terraces</u> The pre-application advice cites the 'noise and disturbance' that would be created by the proposed rear and roof terraces. We are particularly concerned by the two rear terraces at first-floor level. As the pre-application letter states, <i>'Each rear terrace would serve a different flat giving the opportunity for occupiers of multiple properties to use these external spaces simultaneously and generate significantly more noise than a single family household.'</i> The terraces remain in the current proposal, and the concerns raised by the Officer have not been addressed.</p>	<p>35</p>	<p>The proposed windows within the side north west elevation are already half frosted. These could be increased to full height obscured glazing if deemed necessary by officers and secured by condition. Flat 4 continues to be served by the rear facing windows onto the step out terrace.</p> <p>There is no direct overlooking of any habitable window within No.8 as a result of these side windows.</p>
		<p>36</p>	<p>Please see our comments in respect of this matter made at Point 7</p>

6 Lindfield Gardens / APPLICANT RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION RESPONSES of 21.12.20

:



<p><u>Communal Roof Terrace</u></p> <p>The proposed communal roof terrace has been reduced in size since the pre-application, but at 24m sq is still large enough to ‘generate a significant level of noise and disturbance not typical of Lindfield Gardens, a quiet residential street.’ As the pre-application advice continues, ‘the noise generated could travel relatively long distances in all directions’.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Officer states that ‘A roof terrace on a new crown roof would be visible, both from the street and in private views, which would be an incongruous feature at high level. The terrace would likely cause more visual harm than is indicated on the submitted drawings due to the potential for the collection of large paraphernalia such as umbrellas and planters associated with its outdoor use.’</p> <p>Such noise pollution would greatly impinge on the peace of Flats 1, 2 and 5, 8 Lindfield Gardens, both overlooking the garden of no 6.</p> <p><u>Main Entrance at Side of Property</u></p> <p>The main entrance for eight out of the nine flats has been relocated to the side of the property adjacent to 8 Lindfield Gardens, tucked away at the end of a narrow passageway where the property’s service entrance is currently located. It seems inappropriate to block off the house’s present main entrance (even if maintained as a dummy door), so as to cram in another studio flat. As a result, the foot traffic associated with eight flats will be directed into the narrow side passageway, where it will cause disturbance and noise to the residents of No. 8.</p> <p>It also raises questions of escape routes in the case of fire.</p> <p><u>Front Elevation</u></p> <p>He landscaping proposed to hide the ugly frontage would be welcome. However, I doubt that the proposals would achieve this and ‘significantly contribute to enhancing the appearance of the property’.</p> <p>It’s also difficult to envisage how this could be achieved and suspicious must remain that such landscaping would amount to nothing more than a few puny trees and plants as had been the case in the last ten years.</p> <p>It should be also be noted that the proposals would merely meet the obligations of the original planning permission of 2008 and the applicant is merely proposing to partially meet those original obligations they have failed to do in the last 10 years.</p>	<p>37 Please see our comments in respect of this matter made at Point 8</p> <p>The terrace could not be visible from any flat within No.8 It is effectively hidden, behind the high ridge line that runs along the length of the building form as it faces No.8</p> <p>38 Please see out comments in respect of the side entrance arrangement set out at Point No.4 above.</p> <p>The access to the flats at No 8 is via an entrance located at one side of the front elevation, This is not dissimilar to the same the type of residential access at No.8 arrangement that the occupier at No 8 objects to.</p> <p>No one has suggested that the occupants of No.8 have or would cause reciprocal disturbance to the occupants of No6 by virtue of their side residential access point, adjacent to N0.6</p> <p>39 please see our comments in respect of landscaping and the front elevation made at Point No.2 above.</p> <p>A full landscape scheme can be secured by condition.</p> <p>Any mitigation would be better than what is here at this stage</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

6 Lindfield Gardens / APPLICANT RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION RESPONSES of 21.12.20

:



	<p><u>Accommodation</u> It's difficult to avoid the view that the argument for new/affordable housing is merely a camouflage to avoid the charge of building a high density property of poor quality dwellings. The current plan appears to compromise the quality of these new dwellings at the expense of cramming in more units than the space can accommodate.</p> <p>The pre-application advice letter expressed concerns as to whether the smaller proposed units would fully comply with all space standards, concluding that the '<i>quality of accommodation for some flats would be substandard</i>'. Some of those concerns remain in the current proposal. It is still unclear, for example, whether the second-floor units would meet the 2.3m minimum ceiling height across 75% of their Gross Internal Area, since only the '1.5m height line' has been marked on the drawings where the floorspace is extensively tucked under the eaves.</p>	40	<p>Please see out comments made at Point 11</p> <p>These are not undersized or cramped in flats: they meet the required space standards.</p>
	<p><u>Consultation with Neighbours</u> There has been no consultation. In fact, any approach to the owners has been rebuffed. This suggests the owner/developer's aggressive disregard for the concerns of neighbours, and unwillingness to work towards a mutually agreeable outcome.</p> <p>The Council's pre-application letter is clear in advising the applicant to '<i>enter into consultation with local residents and the Redington Frogna! Neighbourhood Forum at this stage, in order to fully understand and address their concerns before an application is made.</i>'</p>	41	
	<p><u>Parking</u> Nine extra dwellings would considerably increase the demand for parking spaces in the street with a limited ability to absorb such increased demand. This has not been addressed by the applicant.</p>	42	<p>In terms of car free development. We refer to our comments made above at Point No.3</p> <p>The development will be car free in accordance with Policy T2.</p>
	<p><u>Additional comments</u> I would also like to express considerable misgivings about the care and attention that would be given to the execution of this development.</p> <p>During the first building works from 2010 onwards I was a daily witness to the ill supervised, intermitted, much delayed and careless building works. The building remained half- finished and neglected for the best part of the last 10 years. The trees with TPs were never replaced.</p> <p>The near disastrous unanticipated collapse of the wall and soil between no 6 and no 8 during the removal of the entire front of no 6 (previously a mature garden that had held the soil) indicates to me careless structural work planning in an area built on clay.</p> <p>Taking into consideration of all the above points I ask the Council to refuse permission for the building of the proposed plans.</p>	43	<p>We only assure officers that all conditions and all key building control standards will be complied with.</p>

6 Lindfield Gardens / APPLICANT RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION RESPONSES of 21.12.20

:



<p>Harlan Zimmerman</p> <p>Objection 26 Redington Road 7 / 12 /20</p>	<p>Dear Ms Meynell,</p> <p>I would like to add my voice to the strong chorus of objections to planning application 2020/4570/P.</p> <p>What has already been done on this site is a tragedy. It is my hope and expectation that Camden will not permit things to get worse and will ultimately reject this bold and egregious application for additional expansion and development. The application feels as if it were developed with 100% focus on maximizing development profit, with no regard for planning, neighboring amenity and other restrictions.</p> <p>In particular, I object to the mass of the upper floor extensions, the height of the proposed extensions, and the poor design that obliterates what remains of the distinguishing features of the house (following the the past work). The proposed patio doors are an eyesore, and I am highly concerned that the many proposed terraces will lead to significant noise and disturbance, and would create a harmful precedent that other would be developers would seek to follow.</p> <p>The current front elevation is a travesty - an eyesore that spoils that side of the road and that resulted from an abuse of the planning process. Further development, as proposed, will worsen what is already a bad situation.</p> <p>I urge you to reject this abysmal proposal, and to stand steadfast in the face of likely repeated attempts to get it through, unless it is scaled down substantially, and as a result of due consultation.</p>	<p>This response is from a resident who lives in Redington Road, approx. <u>630m</u> distance (as the crow flies) from the application site.</p> <p>There is no possibility that the residential amenity of this resident could be affected in any way by these proposals.</p> <p>It is agreed that, as existing, this is an unattractive building. Even the Council's own CA Audit notes this is a poor area of the conservation area.</p> <p>We happy to agree with the objector that much could be done to improve to the front elevation. That is what this application proposes.</p> <p>The existing terrace exists as a matter of fact. It was granted permission. A clear planting scheme for approval by the LPA can help enhance this frontage.</p> <p>We are looking to provide a clear and obvious enhancement to the appearance of the main dwelling, to remedy the unsightly windows and the bland, dull pebble dash.</p> <p>This application proposes visual enhancements/ replacement of UPVC windows, to the main elevation. These are clearly shown on the submitted plans and can only (with a reasonable assessment) be classed as an enhancement over the existing.</p> <p>The massing and design of the rear elevations cannot be seen in the public realm: these are large plots and large dwelling. The Planning and Heritage Statement sets out the justification and assessment of the extensions against the dwellings and the surroundings including the conservation area</p> <p>Please see our comments in respect of this matter made at Point No.5</p> <p>The objector is concerned about noise from small step out terraces.</p> <p>Please see our comments in respect of this matter at:</p> <p>-Rear terraces Point No. 7</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------