

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1901/P	Susanne Griffin	01/06/2022 23:59:55	OBJNOT	<p>This resubmission is much better, both in terms of its overall design and the attention given to its potential impact on neighbours and wildlife, including reducing light pollution.</p> <p>I was pleased to see a reduction in the amount of garden space lost and that by digging up the existing layers of concrete slabs, the owner planned to recreate some 'green' garden space instead. The sedum roof plan, if this is viable in the long term, would also be a welcome move towards improving local biodiversity.</p> <p>However, I am very concerned that the applicant argues that planning agreement for the extension should be granted because its neighbouring property already has an overly long and intrusive extension. It is stated that this new application is 'subordinate' to its neighbour.</p> <p>I object to this applicant being granted their planning permission on the basis of using this particular argument as supporting evidence and justification, because it would in my opinion set a precedent, a precedent that could subsequently be used by other less scrupulous developers perhaps already planning to extend as far as possible into what remains of interconnecting garden space all along York Way and Marquis Road. The question should be, why was the neighbouring overly long extension permitted, or did the building predate York Way being included in the Camden Square Conservation Area?</p> <p>I am also concerned that, given the ongoing issues regarding population growth in London and increasing frequency of summer droughts with the changing climatic conditions, that Camden Council is not routinely advising that all new proposed building development applications should include grey water recycling and rain water harvesting for gardening use etc., as a standard part of the plans to help 'future proof' new buildings as much as possible. I noted that in this application, there is no planned water harvesting and although double glazing is included, the level of general building insulation was not (as far as I could see) specifically referred to. Would it not be relatively straightforward and cheaper to include such measures when a building is being redeveloped, rather than eventually having to add such measures retrospectively?</p> <p>With respect to the boxes ticked by the applicant concerning 'Biodiversity Conservation', unfortunately to my knowledge no assessment of existing biodiversity and species present has ever been done.</p> <p>My argument is that therefore it isn't really possible to be sure whether or not there is 'reasonable likelihood' of nearby biodiversity features 'being affected adversely or conserved and enhanced within the application site'. This lack of information is very unfortunate state of affairs going forward, since I am aware that other planning applications are being submitted along both York Way and Marquis Road, seeking to further erode the already narrow existing green garden spaces. Please could the Council help local people to conduct local biodiversity assessments.</p> <p>My final comment concerns the canopy of the neighbouring tree seen on the drawings in this application and my question is whether or not a tree survey has been done to check whether the roots of the tree might potentially interfere with the proposed new building and wall plans?</p> <p>If the above matters were to be appropriately addressed, my comment would be that these revised plans are much improved.</p>