

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0748/P	bernadette knox	10/04/2022 21:06:40	OBJ	<p>I have read with interest the revised planning submission. I appreciate the way that comments have been taken into account with regard to a pitched instead of a flat roof, and that more attention has been paid to the environmental aspect of both the roof and landscaping the rear garden. This all sounds very positive.</p> <p>However, the one thing I haven't been able to compare is the footprint of this extension to that of the previous proposal. It seems that both are 102 msq. I am therefore not sure where the reduction is. I already feel that an extension upon an extension is not great in principle. I remain concerned about the erosion of quality "breathing space" between the backs of the houses in Marquis Road and York Way. It has been reduced so badly already, that I really feel we need to preserve what remains. For that reason, and in the absence of more detailed information, I'm afraid I still object.</p>
2022/0748/P	bernadette knox	10/04/2022 21:06:44	OBJ	<p>I have read with interest the revised planning submission. I appreciate the way that comments have been taken into account with regard to a pitched instead of a flat roof, and that more attention has been paid to the environmental aspect of both the roof and landscaping the rear garden. This all sounds very positive.</p> <p>However, the one thing I haven't been able to compare is the footprint of this extension to that of the previous proposal. It seems that both are 102 msq. I am therefore not sure where the reduction is. I already feel that an extension upon an extension is not great in principle. I remain concerned about the erosion of quality "breathing space" between the backs of the houses in Marquis Road and York Way. It has been reduced so badly already, that I really feel we need to preserve what remains. For that reason, and in the absence of more detailed information, I'm afraid I still object.</p>
2022/0748/P	Jane Duran	10/04/2022 18:21:54	OBJ	<p>I objected to the previous application for a rear extension to this property. This renewed application raises the same concerns.</p> <p>The proposed extension builds on an existing extension. As residents of Marquis Road, when we applied for planning permission to do a rear extension of our property in 2010, Camden's development rules stated that the single storey extension would not exceed beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling house by more than 3 metres. We kept to this restriction for our extension.</p> <p>Such limitations make good sense. The gardens between Marquis Road and York Way are very small and there have been many extensions built over them. This has unfortunate consequences: noise pollution due to gatherings on de facto roof terraces; less privacy as gardens are overlooked; light pollution; less wildlife, a depleted bird and bee population; less good, clean air; less natural drainage to cope with the increased rainfall caused by climate change.</p> <p>With these concerns in mind, I strongly object to the proposed extension. I do hope that Camden will help to preserve the already sadly diminished green spaces between Marquis Road and York Way.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0748/P	Daniel Penny	07/04/2022 14:43:38	OBJ	<p>Objection.</p> <p>Planning Application - 2022/0748/P</p> <p>Site Address 70 Flat A Marquis Road London Camden NW1 9UB</p>

Date 7th April 2022

Submitted by: Daniel Penny, 72 Marquis Road NW1 9UB

I am the owner of 72 Marquis Road the adjoining structure next door to submitted application for lower ground floor alterations at 70A; the proposed conversion of a two bedroom flat into enlarged flat with a rear kitchen/ living extension.

I make the following observations in objecting to the proposals for the rearward extension.

1. This application is a duplicate of the application made by the same applicant in August 2021 under ref 2021/3928/P in respect of the same property.

That application for a rear extension was turned down.

The applicant agreed with the council not to build further in depth than the existing rear building line.

2021/3928/P – Council Consultation Summary Extract:

“Following negotiations, the proposal to extend beyond the existing rear building line was omitted and an amended, reduced proposal, no further in depth than the existing rear building line was submitted.”

2021/3928/P – Council Decision Extract:

“Special attention has been paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area, under s.72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended by the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act 2013.”

In showing the side extension already existing the reapplication is misleading and seeks to confuse proper consideration. The side extension does NOT exist.

2. No elevations, photographs or sections are provided to show relationships at the rear of my property (see below).

The diagrams that are provided are misleading and inaccurate. The party wall/ fence is 7.5 ft tall not 9ft (as incorrectly stated in the application) meaning there would be considerable overhang casting my garden/ patio in even further shadow. The application mentions a pitched roof whereas the diagrams detail a flat roof. The side extension doesn't exist.

3. The application should be refused as the proposed SECOND rear extension of a further 2.7m into the garden (taking it some 7 to 8m in total from their/ my original wall) is beyond the previous limitation for terraced properties along Marquis Road. A very small proportion of the garden will remain unbuilt.

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

The current extension is already at the limit under the 45 degree test and my right to light will be compromised with a further extension.

It would reduce my amenity, be overbearing to my garden/ patio use (my garden is already boxed in on both sides due to extensions which already reduce light and air flow), and is outwith the:

i) keeping of integrity of terraced houses in this conservation area.

ii) detract from the positive contribution to the character of the area.

iii) and likely to set an unwarranted precedent not supported by the Camden Square Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy, as quoted below.

“Private rear gardens quietly add to the quality and biodiversity of the area. The gardens are almost all hidden from the street, glimpses to green space hidden behind and between buildings are precious and add to the quality of the area.”

In summary this application should be refused as it contains inaccurate information and seeks to confuse in order to circumvent Council planning decisions and previously agreed upon building constraints.
