

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/5899/P	Emma & Edward Jack	15/02/2021 12:13:11	OBJ	

Dear Nora-Andreea,

We refer to planning application 2020/5899/P to which we would like to file an objection. Planning application 2020/5899/P is related to planning application 2020/0511/P, which was approved 31 July 2020 and for which construction is ongoing but details of which have not been included in the drawings for application 2020/5899/P. Both applications are related to residential dwellings at 65 Agar Grove.

Objection as follows:

1. Currently there is a large open area of gardens butting on to each other between Agar Grove and St Paul's Crescent. This is for the visual enjoyment of residents as well as the home to wildlife. The construction of the single story dwelling detailed in 2020/5899/P would significantly interrupt this open space.
2. The single story dwelling would come over existing brick wall boundaries and impose on neighboring gardens and the light in their gardens. It would also interfere with the view of neighboring properties, including ours.
3. The application 2020/0511/P details a communal garden for the flats in 65 Agar Grove, this would no longer be the case given the space would be used for an additional residential dwelling.
4. The drawings submitted with application 2020/5899/P are misleading, not detailing the single story extension granted (and already built) in planning application 2020/0511/P. The implication is that the combination of the extensions across both applications means little to no garden would be left at the rear of 65 Agar Grove with very dense and imposing residential brick dwellings covering the land.
5. There are currently two large trees in the back of the garden at 65 Agar Grove which adds to the aesthetics of the area, important habitat and sanctuary for wildlife and also provide privacy for residents. For us, it shields neighboring houses providing a pleasant view and privacy for us on the first and second floor of our back windows meaning we cannot see in to the houses opposite. These trees would need to be taken down if the single story dwelling in 2020/0511/P was to be developed. We could not see any mention of this in the planning application, in fact, they state in section 18 of the application form that there are no trees or hedges on the proposed development site, which is false and misleading.

A further objection, related to the planning for 2020/0511/P. The planning consent includes a small balcony of 7sqm on top of the single story extension and with access from the first floor flat, next to which there will be a green roof. The drawings attached to the application clearly show the fencing for the balcony extending only to cover the 7sqm approved balcony. Current building work have the fencing extending the full length and width of the single story extension, meaning more intrusive on privacy for neighboring gardens as well as more visually intrusive for all neighboring properties.

We are sending some photographs over email to planning@camden.gov.uk of both the trees we have referred to related to planning application 2020/5899/P and the fencing for application 2020/0511. Email titled Objection Planning Application 2020/5899/P.

Kind regards,

Emma & Edward Jack