

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/5899/P	Kirsten Ed	28/02/2021 20:42:57	PETITNOBJ E	<p>Hi there, I am the owner of the ground floor flat two doors down from this property - 69a Agar Grove. I am really concerned by this planning request.</p> <p>These are on a few grounds;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Garden space, and properties with garden space, are rare enough in London that it seems entirely unnecessary and objectionable to convert a piece of aesthetic greenery into a property. The space is small, and will impact the views of the neighbours as well as change the nature of the area for all future residents, with no going back.2. This is an area of wildlife, with birds and creatures living here. There would also need to be the removal of some large, scenic trees. This seems a real shame. I cannot see any benefit of this.3. Current building work they have done seems to be against the nature of what has been approved. It does not seem as though there is much concern for the history of this area or the aesthetics of it.4. As a resident of the area, it will damage my quality of life and enjoyment of living here. <p>I really hope this is not approved. I believe it will set a dangerous precedent.</p> <p>Kirsten</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/5899/P	Richard May & Gillian May	01/03/2021 12:53:37	COMMNT	<p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>Based on the Planning Documents submitted, we should like to object to Application No.2020/5899/P concerning the proposal at 65 Agar Grove NW1, and on following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The colour overhead view of the area, a photograph heavily photoshopped, shows the new building in the wrong garden. -It is shown occupying No 67 Agar Grove's garden. No.67 can clearly be identified by its red tiled roof - unlike No 65, the next house down, which has slates. -Look at No.71 - the first of the terrace houses in Agar Grove - where the shot is almost vertical, and work three properties down. That is where the proposed building should have been placed. Altogether a misleading illustration. -The illustration does not show the large new ground floor extension built out from No.65. Again this is misleading. -Together, the extension and the planned building will almost eliminate the garden at that address. -The illustration shows a remarkable treescape of almost jungle-like density and extent, and having been heavily touched in. It depicts a far denser picture of tree foliage than is actually the case. -There are in fact two large trees at the bottom-end of the garden at No.65 that will have to be cut down if the building proceeds. This despite there being a 'No' answer to the direct question about the same matter in the planning application questionnaire. -These two trees are not visible in the colour illustration as the large dark green tree (centre) obscures the end of the garden at No.65. But they are there nevertheless. -The proposed building is out of character with the area in positioning and nature. -It will encroach on the amenities afforded to existing residents and wildlife alike. The trees and gardens provide a source of food and sanctuary for birds and small mammals; and a welcome vista in an otherwise urban townscape. -Proposed Bricks: The Application talks of 'London Stocks' in the Preamble, and yet further on in the same document it states 'Bricks: Red' - which is the correct proposal? -How long will the grass on the roof last? Who will tend it? -The new extension built at No.65 is already considerably larger than any of the other existing ones along that stretch of Agar Grove - and is allowable more or less by right given the new planning laws. Therefore scrutiny and consideration of this new application all the more relevant where some control can still be exercised over development to the area.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>-Equally the owners of the Proposed New Building, if built, would in turn be able to extend their property by right, worsening the problem.</p> <p>-Allow one, and it becomes very difficult to refuse others. does this not set a precedent? - the very last thing a Conservation Area needs.</p> <p>-There is the potential for another five of these buildings in the longer gardens (with yet another in the central triangle), and with new back extensions of the size at No. 65. This would effectively eliminate all the largest gardens in the triangle.</p> <p>-All the houses that look out over the triangle are of 3 or 4 story construction, so residents' views here will be disproportionately affected, compared properties offering a lower, less elevated view.</p> <p>-Any further construction will see the end of more trees in an area that has already lost a great many down the years. The more an area is developed, the less the chance and availability of room to plant replacements.</p> <p>-Is it not very much public policy now to encourage the planting of trees - rather than to allow the destruction of existing ones?</p> <p>-It will alter an almost unchanged Victorian 'Conservation Area' - the very opposite of 'conserving' what is already there.</p> <p>-There is no mention of parking spaces, if only for visitors, in an area already hard pressed for for spaces.</p> <p>We urge the Council to reject this application.</p> <p>Richard and Gillian May</p>

2020/5899/P	Henning Stummel	04/03/2021 15:31:34	COMMNT	<p>The key question is, do we accept densification in built up urban areas?</p> <p>The proposal goes out of its way to be low in impact:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - perimeter walls to adjacent gardens are low, so that overshadowing is very limited and negligible - the roof is planted, thereby reducing visual impact and dealing with rain water runoff - the plan is inward looking, ensuring the privacy of neighbours and limiting light pollution. - The design has been produced by a multi ward winning London architect. <p>The national planning framework encourages development and this proposal has been carefully considered.</p>
-------------	-----------------	---------------------	--------	---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/5899/P	Richard May	01/03/2021 14:27:23	OBJ	Dear Sirs,

Based on the Planning Documents submitted, we should like to object to Application No.2020/5899/P concerning the proposal at 65 Agar Grove NW1, and on following grounds:

- The colour overhead view of the area, a photograph heavily photoshopped, shows the new building in the wrong garden.
- It is shown occupying No 67 Agar Grove's garden. No.67 can clearly be identified by its red tiled roof - unlike No 65, the next house down, which has slates.
- Look at No.71 - the first of the terrace houses in Agar Grove - where the shot is almost vertical, and work three properties down. That is where the proposed building should have been placed. A misleading illustration.
- The illustration does not show the large new ground floor extension built out from No.65. Again this is misleading.
- Together, the extension and the planned building will almost eliminate the garden at that address.
- The illustration shows a remarkable treescape of almost jungle-like density and extent, and has been heavily touched in. It depicts a far denser picture of tree foliage than is actually the case.
- There are in fact two large trees at the bottom-end of the garden at No.65 that will have to be cut down if the building proceeds. This despite there being a 'No' answer to the direct question about trees in the planning application questionnaire.
- These two trees are not visible in the colour illustration as the large dark green tree (centre) obscures the end of the garden at No.65. But they are there nevertheless.
- The proposed building is out of character with the area in positioning and nature.
- It will encroach on the amenities afforded to existing residents and wildlife alike. The trees and gardens provide a source of sanctuary and food for birds and small mammals; and a welcome vista in an otherwise urban townscape.
- Proposed Bricks: The Application talks of 'London Stocks' in the Preamble, and yet further on in the same document it states 'Bricks: Red' - which is the correct proposal?
- How long will the grasses on the roof last? Who will tend to it?
- The new extension built at No.65 is already considerably larger than any of the other existing ones along that stretch of Agar Grove - and is allowable more or less by right given the new planning laws. Therefore scrutiny and consideration of this new application is all the more relevant where some control can still be exercised over development to the area.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>-Equally the owners of the Proposed New Building, if built, would in turn be able to extend their property as of by right, so worsening the problem.</p> <p>-Allow one, and it becomes very difficult to refuse others. does this not set a precedent? - the very last thing a Conservation Area needs.</p> <p>-There is the potential for another five of these buildings in the longer gardens (with yet a 6th in the central triangle), and with new back extensions of the size at No. 65. This would effectively eliminate all the largest gardens in the triangle.</p> <p>-All the houses that look out over the triangle are of 3 or 4 story construction, so residents' views here will be disproportionately affected, compared with properties offering a lower, less elevated view.</p> <p>-Any further construction will see the end of more trees in an area that has already lost a great many down the years. The more an area is developed, the less the chance and availability of space to plant replacements.</p> <p>-Is it not very much public policy now to encourage the planting of trees - rather than to allow the destruction of existing ones?</p> <p>-It will alter an almost unchanged Victorian 'Conservation Area' - the very opposite of 'conserving' what is already there.</p> <p>We urge the Council to reject this application.</p> <p>Richard and Gillian May</p>

2020/5899/P	Elizabeth Lane	28/02/2021 14:28:28	OBJ	<p>I wish to lodge an objection to this proposal which represents an incongruous and inappropriate development in the conservation area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is no precedent for backland development in the conservation area. - The proposed house would reduce the garden space which has already been allocated as communal garden space for the flats being created by subdividing the house at 65 Agar Grove. - The open gardens to the rear of houses in both Agar Grove and St Pauls Cres are a feature of the conservation area and contribute to the biodiversity and generally outlook and amenity of residents. - two substantial trees will be felled in order to construct this. - The proposed footprint of the house abuts three neighbouring boundaries; no heights or levels have been given on the submitted drawings and they lack any technical detail in order to describe the proposal adequately.
-------------	----------------	---------------------	-----	---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/5899/P	Adam and Deborah	28/02/2021 12:31:59	COMMNT	<p>We concur with the other comments and those of Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee who wrote that:</p> <p>¿This is nothing more than an outline plan and a try-on. It does not merit a detailed response and should be immediately rejected. In our view, it should never have been registered in the first place¿ and for the reasons they have set out in their fuller response to Camden Planning particularly in regards to paras 6.37 and 6.38 of the Camden Local Plan dealing with the protection of gardens from development.</p> <p>Additionally, the boundary line on the planning notification drawing pinned to the tree in our is completely different from the one on the planning notification. Which one is correct and which one are we objecting to?</p>
