

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/2445/P	IS	13/10/2022 11:08:43	OBJ	<p>I would like to object to this proposed amendment to this application to retain a set of French doors for 'maintenance purposes,' and request that the council requires the owners of the property to reinstate the sash window above the ground floor extension that was agreed in planning application 2021/1692/P.</p> <p>There is no reason why a pair of French doors would be necessary for maintenance purposes as the roof of the ground floor extension is easily accessible by a ladder for any necessary maintenance. Furthermore, it seems rather unsafe to have a set of doors leading to an open roof area in a family home with children likely to be present.</p> <p>Rather this seems to be an attempt to exploit a loophole to have a de facto balcony (which it should be noted has been strongly opposed by myself and other residents in previous comments to the earlier version of this application). It also seems likely that the applicants will at a later date try to apply for another application to convert it to an official balcony with balustrades on safety grounds, as a way to overcome the objections raised to the instalment of a balcony in the earlier version of this application.</p>
2022/2445/P	IS	13/10/2022 11:08:32	OBJ	<p>I would like to object to this proposed amendment to this application to retain a set of French doors for 'maintenance purposes,' and request that the council requires the owners of the property to reinstate the sash window above the ground floor extension that was agreed in planning application 2021/1692/P.</p> <p>There is no reason why a pair of French doors would be necessary for maintenance purposes as the roof of the ground floor extension is easily accessible by a ladder for any necessary maintenance. Furthermore, it seems rather unsafe to have a set of doors leading to an open roof area in a family home with children likely to be present.</p> <p>Rather this seems to be an attempt to exploit a loophole to have a de facto balcony (which it should be noted has been strongly opposed by myself and other residents in previous comments to the earlier version of this application). It also seems likely that the applicants will at a later date try to apply for another application to convert it to an official balcony with balustrades on safety grounds, as a way to overcome the objections raised to the instalment of a balcony in the earlier version of this application.</p>
2022/2445/P	IS	13/10/2022 11:09:49	OBJ	<p>I would like to object to this proposed amendment to this application to retain a set of French doors for 'maintenance purposes,' and request that the council requires the owners of the property to reinstate the sash window above the ground floor extension that was agreed in planning application 2021/1692/P.</p> <p>There is no reason why a pair of French doors would be necessary for maintenance purposes as the roof of the ground floor extension is easily accessible by a ladder for any necessary maintenance. Furthermore, it seems rather unsafe to have a set of doors leading to an open roof area in a family home with children likely to be present.</p> <p>Rather this seems to be an attempt to exploit a loophole to have a de facto balcony (which it should be noted has been strongly opposed by myself and other residents in previous comments to the earlier version of this application). It also seems likely that the applicants will at a later date try to apply for another application to convert it to an official balcony with balustrades on safety grounds, as a way to circumvent the objections raised to the instalment of a balcony in the earlier version of this application.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/2445/P	Janet Langdon	16/10/2022 21:34:00	OBJ	<p>Although this application is described as a Residential Minor Alteration it could, if approved, cause many people a lot of distress.</p> <p>Considering this planning application, it is necessary to review the history of 35 and 37 Fairfax Place. The houses were built around 1962 and each house had a little garden. Then the owners of 35 and 37 Fairfax Place (not the current owners) were able to obtain extra land at the back of their houses. The current owners of 37 Fairfax Place erected a rear dormer on this land - a single storey rear extension planning permission 2016/0364/P. Then the owner of 37 Fairfax Place bought 35 Fairfax Place two years ago and these two houses are being combined. Now, the owners are asking for replacement of a window with a new door on to the roof of the ground floor rear extension for maintenance. In their application, it says the roof will not be used as a terrace, access for maintenance only. This is a most extraordinary request as it would mean that any maintenance would be done from the main house rather than from ground level. I believe that the only reason for this request of replacing the window with a double door is to use the single storey rear extension as a terrace. There should be no door on to the roof of the extension. This should not be allowed as people will be on the terrace and looking straight into other people's houses and gardens. Many residents of Fairfax Place will have their privacy reduced.</p> <p>I live at 43 Fairfax Place, a little way from 37 Fairfax Place, but if there are people on the terrace they would be able to look straight into my bedroom. Many of the other houses in Fairfax Place would also be overlooked and especially into their little gardens. Hence there would be a real loss of privacy and also there could be a lot of noise.</p> <p>This is a one off request as no other house in Fairfax Place has the necessary space to build ground floor extensions.</p> <p>If Camden Council approve this application, it will mean many residents will suffer as they will be overlooked and the noise could also be considerable. I hope therefore that Camden will not approve this application and ensure that there are no doors allowed from the first floor on to the flat roof.</p>
2022/2445/P	Joan Downton	15/10/2022 18:03:09	OBJ	<p>My house, 33 Fairfax Place, is adjacent to 35 Fairfax Place and I have lived here since it was built in 1962 - some 60 years. One of the joys of my house is my little secluded garden, which, if there is access to either of the balconies in 35/37 Fairfax Place would result in my being overlooked and my privacy would be taken away from me. Also it could be extremely noisy. Hence I request that, at no time, should there be a door from the main house 35/37 Fairfax Place on to either of the two balconies of 35/37 Fairfax Place. If there is a door it is too easy for the balconies to be used for recreational purposes. I should add that the owners of 35/37 Fairfax Place have never discussed their proposals with me.</p>
2022/2445/P	Miss Elizabeth Fenner	16/10/2022 20:24:09	OBJ	<p>I am writing to object to this RETROSPECTIVE application. WITHOUT PLANNING PERMISSION DOUBLE DOORS HAVE ALREADY BEEN INSTALLED ! This is a "stealth project" to try to reinstate turning the roof into a terrace, which raised so many objections to the previous application that the plan was withdrawn. The terrace will overlook the many gardens around, intruding on the privacy of neighbours, and raising the level of noise in the vicinity. There is no need for a door in order to maintain the roof of the extension which is, and has been for years, accessible via a ladder.</p>