

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1901/P	Bernadette Knox	09/06/2022 17:23:00	OBJ	<p>I'm sorry, but I'm afraid I still object to this proposal.</p> <p>While it is an undoubted improvement on the previous plans, it is still an extension on an extension, and as such would continue the erosion of light, space and air quality in the back area between York Way and Marquis Road.</p>
2022/1901/P	Ros Franey	08/06/2022 16:01:08	OBJ	<p>I am continuing to object to this extension-to-an-extension because these new plans do not address my main concern about the piecemeal infilling of green space between York Way and Marquis Road. Yes, 95a now lines up with the extension next door, but that extension is intrusive. The new footprint at 95 will still be uncomfortably close to the garden of my neighbours at 76 Marquis Road, and to me at 78. That I'll be directly affected is all too clear from the extension of a similar length to a house further away from me on the other side: I'm forced to participate in the life of the people who live there to an extent that neither they, nor I, would choose. This was never intended when the houses were originally built - in a less environmentally enlightened age than ours - and it certainly shouldn't be happening in a conservation area today.</p> <p>When he turned up on my doorstep to discuss his new plans, the 95a York Way applicant stressed the green credentials of what he wants to do, a switch from his original plan to build almost down to my neighbours' garden wall. It's clear from the neighbouring property at 93 York Way, whose extension he now proposes to match, that the revised garden area, described as 'large' and 'generous' in the plans, will actually be pretty small. And the much-emphasised green roof is a puzzle: I'm unsure how it will be maintained. The residents won't be able to see it from ground level, and it will presumably survive only for as long as they or their successors continue to water it. Green roofs need upkeep, weeding and feeding, and I'm not sure how they'll even get up there to do that. The plans don't say.</p> <p>I would like to correct a small error in the application that attributes the laurel tree in the corner of the garden to 97 York Way. It's actually my laurel tree, and I explained to Dr Knapp when he came to see me that we let it grow for protection, after a shooting incident in the 1990s. A previous occupant of 95 York Way was firing an air rifle into our bedroom at 78 Marquis Road and into the sitting-room at 76. He was shooting at random from the first-floor window in the existing extension at 95. Apart from explaining my tree, the relevance of this to the present application is that it illustrates just how close our houses already are, and how interdependent.</p> <p>It's for this reason that my principal objection to an extension that would bring us even closer is that there are already far too many long back extensions up and down York Way. Individually they may not be damaging, but collectively they are seriously degrading the space between our two rows of houses. I set out the nature of this damage in my comment on the previous plans for 95a: light, air and noise pollution as a result of the increased population density in these new extensions; invasion of neighbours' privacy; and encroachment on the diminishing number of trees and gardens that allow our fragile birdlife to survive. The revised plans don't substantially alter this. It's surely illogical for the Council to keep allowing ever more private development to eat up this precious open space, while their own new-build public housing clearly recognises the need for space, fresh air and greenery - as in the new Agar Grove estate.</p>

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

2022/1901/P	Jane Duran	08/06/2022 11:37:58	OBJ	
-------------	------------	---------------------	-----	--

I strongly object to this new application for an extension to 95A York Way for the following reasons.

The new proposal states that the existing rear line of the extension to no. 93 York Way is respected and has become the rear limit for the proposal. The extension to 93 York Way is an extension of an extension, and is one of many long extensions encroaching on the greatly depleted open garden space between York Way and Marquis Road houses.

As I have commented in response to other applications for extensions to extensions, 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. Our garden is small as are all the gardens backing Marquis Road and York Way; all the more reason for Camden to protect and preserve as much green space as possible.

Although the new application for 95A York Way has reduced the proposed scale of the extension, it would still be an extension of an extension, leaving a substantially reduced garden space. As our garden faces 95A's rear garden, losing that space between our houses would directly impact on us and feel intrusive.

In addition, the provision of a sedum roof does not guarantee its long-term maintenance or ensure that in the future the flat roof will not be used as a roof terrace by occupants of the flat above.

Most importantly, approval of this extension would continue to encourage applications of this nature, cumulatively eroding whatever open green space, drainage, wildlife, sunlight and good clean air remain between the houses of York Way and Marquis Road.

I sincerely hope that Camden will not approve this application.