

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/5899/P	Benjamin Lesser	21/02/2021 23:14:42	OBJ	<p>As the owner of the flat at 67c Agar Grove, and a qualified Architect, I am deeply concerned about this planning application on several fronts, material to planning. My strong objections to this application are listed below and which the Camden Planning Department need to take in to account please.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There has been absolutely no consultation with us as immediate neighbours who will be impacted by the proposal.</li> <li>- This is a Conservation Area with high density housing stock and small rear gardens which are highly used and needed external amenity space for residents.</li> <li>- The proposed apartment extends for the full width of the rear garden space and takes up half of its area. It is larger in footprint than the footprint of the principal house. This is over development of the site and has detrimental impact to our amenity.</li> <li>- The proposed building is not set back at all from the boundary garden wall. In fact it uses the boundary wall as its external wall. This is not acceptable. The height of the boundary wall is extended along its length and even further in height at the proposed roof profile. This increased height will cause over shadowing to our gardens. Boundary walls and fences have a maximum height and this proposal exceeds that.</li> <li>- It is not acceptable to add a permanent new dwelling in to what is garden space. This will cause increased noise and light pollution into quiet garden spaces.</li> <li>- Any foundations will need to be wholly located within the property boundary of 65 Agar Grove. The boundary wall should not be used as the external wall to the new dwelling.</li> <li>- From the plans it appears that there is independent access from the street (Agar Grove) to the proposed new dwelling via the side passage. This means that this dwelling could in future be an independent residential property. This was never envisaged by the line of semi-detached houses along Agar Grove and again is over development of the plot, creating an additional independent dwelling. Furthermore it would mean increased use of the side passage to gain access. This presents an increased security risk of bringing more people into the rear garden areas of the properties.</li> <li>- From an aesthetic point of view, the proposed building is wholly out of character with those in the Conservation Area. Due to its inward looking requirements, to avoid overlooking the design is very displeasing from every angle, including from above. The quality of space and light to the new rooms created will be of low quality and without any outlook. I question whether this proposal meets the quality standards for new residential dwelling of the London Plan or Camden's own policies.</li> </ul> <p>In conclusion I strongly urge the Council to reject this application.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p> <p>Benjamin Lesser RIBA Owner and Architect</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:	Printed on: 23/02/2021 09:10:05	
2020/5899/P	Fenella Filmer	21/02/2021 16:08:02	OBJ	<p>All</p> <p>This application is completely unacceptable. It will greatly negatively impact the surrounding neighbours and cause road congestion and difficulty in parking not to mention it being an eyesore. Please do not pass the application it is only for the owner to milk as much money out of the site by overcrowding with total disregard for the neighbouring residents. Please see further comments below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There has been absolutely no consultation with us as immediate neighbours who will be impacted by the proposal.</li> <li>- This is a Conservation Area with high density housing stock and small rear gardens which are highly used and needed external amenity space for residents.</li> <li>- The proposed apartment extends for the full width of the rear garden space and takes up half of its area. It is larger in footprint than the footprint of the principal house. This is over development of the site and has detrimental impact to our amenity.</li> <li>- The proposed building is not set back at all from the boundary garden wall. In fact it uses the boundary wall as its external wall. This is not acceptable. The height of the boundary wall is extended along its length and even further in height at the proposed roof profile. This increased height will cause over shadowing to our gardens. Boundary walls and fences have a maximum height and this proposal exceeds that.</li> <li>- It is not acceptable to add a permanent new dwelling in to what is garden space. This will cause increased noise and light pollution into quiet garden spaces.</li> <li>- Any foundations will need to be wholly located within the property boundary of 65 Agar Grove. The boundary wall should not be used as the external wall to the new dwelling.</li> <li>- From an aesthetic point of view, the proposed building is wholly out of character with those in the Conservation Area. Due to its inward looking requirements, to avoid overlooking the design is very displeasing from every angle, including from above. The quality of space and light to the new rooms created will be of low quality and without any outlook. I question whether this proposal meets the quality standards for new residential dwelling of the London Plan or Camden's own policies.</li> </ul> <p>Fenella Filmer 67 D Agar Grove</p> <div data-bbox="662 1205 762 1223" style="background-color: black; height: 8px; width: 63px;"></div>		

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/5899/P	Giulietta Durante	21/02/2021 16:22:49	OBJ	<p>I must object to this application on numerous counts.</p> <p>I am a resident of the property next door to No. 65 and I have already had to suffer the noise and disruption of construction work on the main building of this property for over a year. This has had a very detrimental effect on my mental health as it has been the year when we have all been locked up at home dealing with the effects of a global pandemic and I was unable to take refuge elsewhere to escape from the noise and disruption.</p> <p>My my objections are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The length of time and the extent of disruption the construction of this court house will take. As mentioned above, all residents of no 67 have already endured a year of disruption caused by the construction work on the original building. This has included disturbing levels of noise pollution on a regular basis plus working on bank holidays and weekends. In a year when everyone has been working from home or on furlough and we have been specifically instructed by the government to stay at home this has been particularly stressful as there has been no escape. The thought of another six months to a year of construction is unbearable.</li> <li>2. My next concern is how are the materials going to actually be delivered to the site? The small passageway that provides the only access to the back of the property is too narrow for large building materials. When I spoke to one of the workers on the current site he mentioned that a large crane might be employed to do this. This is very concerning - such a large crane would not only cause unprecedented levels of noise and disruption but would also be a complete eyesore and would mean that no resident of either Agar Grove or Canteloves Road or St Pauls Crescent would have any privacy whatsoever for months on end.</li> <li>3. Additionally I am highly concerned about the health and safety procedures employed by the workers on this site as I have already had to call up and complain to the Council about the burning of toxic building waste in the back garden on numerous occasions. An environmental health officer has been called out a few times and has had to ask them to stop these highly dangerous activities. Other residents of this building have also had to call up Environmental Health on a number of occasions as they seem to have little regard for health and safety procedures or indeed, the environment.</li> <li>4. Even though the planned proposal states that the property will be barely visible and cause little disruption to neighbouring gardens there can be no doubt that if this court house were to go ahead it would irreversibly alter the landscape of this beautifully tranquil space. It also looks like at least one tree will have to be removed which is concerning as London needs all the trees it can get to counteract the effects of the high levels of pollution.</li> <li>5. The court house will also affect access to light in neighbouring gardens. I think we can agree that what this pandemic has shown us is the importance of outdoor spaces and it would be a great shame to lose light and privacy. There has already been talk by the government that we may need to avoid travelling this summer and that we may be urged to stay at home when the weather gets better. It will therefore be more important than ever to have access to quiet, well lit, private spaces.</li> <li>6. The planning application also states that it will 'gently increase density in an urban and central part of London' It seems that the applicants are unaware of the change in housing trends triggered by the pandemic; it is well known that in the past year London has experienced an unprecedented exodus of residents. This</li> </ol>

Printed on: 23/02/2021 09:10:05

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>beggars the question, is this extra construction really needed when over 700,000 people have moved out of London since the beginning of lockdown?</p> <p>I am grateful to be given this opportunity to voice my concerns. Now more than ever I feel it is important to defend our small outdoor spaces that play an invaluable role in both our mental and physical wellbeing.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

---