

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/6168/P	Rooney	19/03/2022 16:28:26	OBJNOT	<p>I wish to record an objection to this application on the basis of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is no clear illustration of the treatment of the Building to the Mill Lane front elevation showing visual representations and the impacts on the street scope. The boundary lines of the property as built extend beyond the neighbouring residence- leaves a very uncoordinated inconsistent elevation to Mill Lane 2. It is clear that this property will set a precedence in mixing habitable space and car parking- this will impact open traffic, & road safety and sets a dangerous precedent going forward. Camden should be limiting car use 3. The proposed building/alterations is significantly higher than neighbouring residential properties.. 4. The pitched "turret style roof additions" add in excess of 1.10m to the building height and are unsightly and out of keeping. 5. The overall height, size Mass, extent/footprint of the building as planned is excessive and out of proportion with the character of Mill lane 6 The Proposed scale of the building impacts on light and privacy on the street scape and neighbours 7 the proposed finishes treatments on elevations are somber. A building of this height and mass in "grey/black" is unsightly and overly oppressive- it doesn't add to the environment 8. I am concerned at the combination of vehicular parking [which I understand is arose from an earlier planning application on the property and 38 Hillfield Rd] with habitable space is an unsuitable use of the Building. <p>I am further concerned at the nature of the proposed upper level extension being lightweight timber construction, while a vehicle is stored within the structure. While car/ vehicular fires while relatively infrequent they do occur, and in such a location would be calamitous.</p> <p>9. As I understand the garage was part of an earlier planning application made while the main residence at 38 was split into two residences. The Property 38 lost its right to residential parking and sought to compensate this via the construction of the as built garage.</p> <p>The DAS states the use of the building is inconsistent with the owners needs- yet this garage and valuable parking space is still being retained in this new application. There are a number of other Garage sites within Mill Lane - and a clear and coherent approach to parking and residential conversions needs to be established and maintained. This change of use does not facilitate this and will set an unwise precedent.</p>
2021/6168/P	P Jones	20/03/2022 17:42:18	OBJ	<p>I object to the development based on the following:</p> <p>The proposal is positioned too close (i.e. the existing garage is set forward of the adjacent dwellings) to the road and forward of all other adjacent dwellings. The proposal is too high and again, inconsistent with adjacent dwellings. The proposal is very ugly and has not been designed sympathetically nor is it in-keeping with adjacent developments. A pitched roof is not consistent with adjacent development on that side of Mill Lane. The proposal would set a worrying precedent if granted permission given it is inconsistent with other small adjacent dwellings. As well as being over bearing on Mill Lane, it would have a negative impact of the lower ground, ground and 1st floor dwellings on the Hillfield Road side by blocking natural light to gardens and windows.</p>