

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/5899/P	Rosa Angela Ragni	23/02/2021 11:38:54	OBJ	<p>Dear Ms Costantinescu,</p> <p>RE: planning application 2020/5899/P, 65 Agar Grove</p> <p>I would like to file an objection on numerous counts to the planning application 2020/5899/P, which is related to planning application 2020/0511/P, 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, thus misleading the impact of the proposed additional residential dwelling on the rear garden of 65 Agar Grove.</p> <p>My concerns are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Presently the rear gardens between Agar Grove, St Paul's Crescent and Canteloves Road form an open area, which is essential for the enjoyment of residents in a neighbourhood with high density housing, besides being home to wildlife. The construction of the proposed additional residential dwelling would significantly interrupt this open space and would interfere with the view of neighbouring properties. 2. The additional residential dwelling extends for the full width of the rear garden space, taking up half of its area and using existing brick wall boundaries as external walls, extending their height. This increased height will cause over shadowing to neighbouring gardens, removing much needed light. Boundary walls and fences have a maximum height and this proposal exceeds that. 3. It is not acceptable to use a boundary wall as the external wall to the new dwelling. Any foundations will need to be wholly located within the property boundary of 65 Agar Grove. 4. The additional dwelling is larger in footprint than the footprint of the main house, and the combination of the size of the two buildings 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. This, besides being detrimental to the neighbouring houses, is over development in a Conservation Area. This would be immediately evident, had the submitted drawings being correct in detailing the single-story extension granted (and already built) in planning application 2020/0511/P. Adding a permanent new dwelling in to what is garden space will also cause increased noise and light pollution into quiet garden spaces. 5. 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, 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 am not certain this proposal meets the quality standards for new residential dwellings of the London Plan or Camden's own policies. 6. The proposed dwelling has no direct street access to Agar Grove whatsoever, the only access being through a very narrow alleyway which gives also access to the lower ground floor flat at 65. This would be rather unpleasant for the people living in the lower ground floor at 65, as the people living in the proposed additional dwelling would have to pass in front and very close to their front door and windows every time they need to get in and out. Furthermore, this will present an increased security risk of bringing more people into the rear garden areas of the properties. Again, this is not evident from the plans, which are misleading. 7. 8. There are currently two large trees in the back of the garden at 65 Agar Grove which add to the aesthetics of the area, are an important habitat and sanctuary for wildlife, counteract the effects of the high levels of pollution, and also provide privacy for residents, shielding neighbouring houses and providing a pleasant view and privacy. These trees would need to be taken down if the additional dwelling in 2020/0511/P were to be developed. There is not 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. 9. The length of time and the extent of disruption the construction of this court house will take needs also to

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

be taken into consideration, especially in a period when everyone has been working from home or on furlough, and specifically instructed by the government to stay at home. There are also concerns about the health and safety procedures employed by the workers on the site of planning application 2020/0511/P. An environmental health officer has been called out multiple times already because of the burning of toxic building waste in the back garden. Since the same builders will do the work for the proposed dwelling, there is the likelihood that will also happen in the future at the proposed building site.

10. Also concerning is how are the materials going to 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. The workers on the current site mention that a large crane might be employed to do this. This would cause unprecedented levels of noise and disruption, besides impacting for months on the privacy of the residents Agar Grove, Cantelowes Road or St Paul's Crescent, and would also be a complete eyesore.

11. The planning application states that it will "gently increase density in an urban and central part of London". Given the change in housing trends triggered by the pandemic, London has experienced in the past year an unprecedented exodus of residents, questioning the need for an additional dwelling.

12. A further objection relates 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 neighbouring gardens as well as more visually intrusive for all neighbouring properties. I would recommend that the planning case officer visit the site and inspect that nothing has contravened the previous approval.

For all the above reasons, I strongly urge the Council to reject this application.

Kind regards,

Rosa Angela Ragni
67A Agar Grove
London NW1 9UE
