

Printed on: 14/12/2022 09:10:20

Application No:	Consultee Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/4042/P	Ros Franey	11/12/2022 17:53:36	OBJ	<p>I submitted an objection to this planning application on 24 November and had an acknowledgment from the council. But I can't see it on the planning application comments page. Nor can I see objections sent by Jane Duran or Dan Penny. Where are they? Today is the deadline for submissions and I'm submitting mine again, but why aren't the objections to this application being publicly displayed? To my earlier comments, I'd like to add that this application is completely at odds with the criteria for future planning laid out in the Camden Local Plan Review. For a repeat of my previous comments, please see below.</p> <p>From: planning@camden.gov.uk Date: 24 November 2022 at 13:08:24 GMT To: [REDACTED] Subject: Comments on 2022/4042/P have been received by the council.</p> <p>I strongly object to this application. First, I don't understand how the applicants can claim that their amended plans don't add anything to their previous submission that could possibly affect neighbours: as far as I can see, the proposal is to turn a present roof terrace on an earlier extension into yet another room, with walls and a ceiling which will inevitably block more light and impinge more invasively on surrounding properties.</p> <p>The house has already been expanded well beyond its original footprint and at a scale incompatible with any claim that it will be architecturally improved by the present proposal. Nor, frankly, can I go along with the assertion that it's a single family house, when neighbours' evidence states that there are multiple occupants who already make a great deal of noise and disturbance. This is surely a house in multiple occupation and the new proposal can only be to cram in more tenants.</p> <p>I live in Marquis Road and am seriously concerned by many recent applications to enlarge the properties in York Way over the entire extent of their land, in some cases up to our garden walls. The houses in our two streets are already very close together and the space between them simply can't take an ever-expanding population. It is environmentally unsound as well as being detrimental to other residents' right to a degree of peace and quiet in their homes and gardens. The proposal at 67 York Way is a prime example: the extra extension upwards will block natural light while generating artificial light pollution at night. It will increase the noise we all have to suffer. And at a time when flood risk is said to be growing, the lack of natural drainage, because every metre of land has been built over, represents a threat to us all.</p> <p>I understand there is nothing that prevents the council from granting planning permission one property at a time - which is what's happening here. But at which point does the cumulative effect of all these planning applications, granted piecemeal, tip the entire area over into something that is not an acceptable living environment?</p> <p>In the Council's own developments it's quite clear that consideration must be given - and has been - to green spaces in between the properties. Why on earth not in Marquis Road and York Way? Our neighbourhood is a conservation area, which covers the gardens of both streets. If the building of sprawling extensions, outwards and upwards, can't be reined in here, then where can it be? If the regulations don't cover this anomaly, then they should be amended urgently. On all these grounds - but specifically with regard to the well-being of the immediate neighbours around 67 York Way - I oppose this application.</p> <p>Comments made by Ros Franey of 78 Marquis Road</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:	Printed on: 14/12/2022 09:10:20
				Phone: [REDACTED] Email: [REDACTED] Preferred Method of Contact is Email  Comment Type is Objection	
2022/4042/P	Daniel Penny	10/12/2022 13:07:35	OBJ	<p>I object to this application. A similar application was denied planning permission 17th Oct 2016.</p> <p>Camden Planning decision:</p> <p>2016/5017/P - Refused 17-10-2016</p> <p>Reason for Refusal</p> <p>1 The proposed extension by virtue of its location, height and design would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host building, the terrace of which it forms part and the Camden Square Conservation Area contrary to policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP24 (Securing high quality design) and DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies. Executive Director Supporting Communities Page 2 of 2 2016/5017/P In dealing with the application, the Council has sought to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive way in accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>There will be significant adverse impacts to the neighbours in terms of view, sunlight, shading and privacy.</p> <p>Also, the ground floor extension doesn't exist. Does this application supersede that planning decision? This is a bolt on which was refused planning permission previously. It should be refused. Previous plans were approved on the basis that there wasn't a second floor extension.</p> <p>The proposed additional second floor extension will block light and create more noise in the adjoining Marquis Road gardens.</p> <p>It will likely set an unwarranted precedent not supported by the Camden Square Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy, as quoted below.</p> <p>'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.'</p> <p>No other nearby house in this terrace has an extension at this level, and the space between the rear of the York Way buildings and those in Marquis Road is already quite confined.</p>	