

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/0396/P	THE HEATH & HAMPSTEAD SOCIETY	23/03/2023 16:22:10	OBJNOT	OBJECTION From: THE HEATH & HAMPSTEAD SOCIETY

This application to add a mansard and dormers to the top of a semi-detached house is totally different from the existing gabled steep, slated, decorative quality of roofs in this part of the Conservation Area.

Unfortunately, in 1959, permission was given for the existing gabled roof to be removed and replaced with an extra floor with a flat roof - totally discordant with the other half of the pair (no. 30) and also with the neighbouring roofscape. This was years before the area was declared a Conservation Area and such a shocking change would certainly not be approved today.

All the existing Victorian houses are stated as contributing to the CA (surprisingly including no 28). However, the Conservation Area Statement also states in 'Current Issues' that the area suffers from:

- unfortunate roof extensions and changes &
- elevational alterations.

Both apply to no 28.

Another essential part of the character of the area is that it is composed of symmetrical pairs of semi detached houses. The flat roof and the small 1st floor windows of no. 28 are very different from no. 30 and spoil the pair.

The proposed mansard and dormers are unacceptable and detract seriously from the Conservation Area.

Please refuse.

However, with careful design it should be possible to reintroduce the gabled roof and the first floor windows, create a harmonious elevation with no.30 - and also construct the extra floor area suggested by the application.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/0396/P	Nigel John Knight	21/03/2023 07:45:19	COMMNT	<p>The location plan attached to this revised/new planning application (erroneously referred to as for 5 Tanza Road) again contains errors concerning the boundary walls between 28 Parliament Hill and Oakford Court. Specifically, it shows a brick pillar that is clearly part of the Oakford Court property included as part of the boundary for 28 Parliament Hill. Given that this is the second time that Norden Neale have attempted - incorrectly - to redefine/extend the boundary of this property - something which the residents of Oakford Court have continued to challenge - I hope that Camden Council will take this into account in any decisions made around the application.</p> <p>More generally, as mentioned in my previous objection, as the legal owner of the ground floor flat in Oakford Court, my major concern with this application (other than ensuring that the boundaries of 28 Parliament Hill are correctly recorded and drawn) is the need to ensure that any building work in this adjacent property ensures that any new building work is structurally/environmentally sound: the end of 28 Parliament Hill garden is significantly higher than my property and I am very concerned about the potential for a collapse/landslide/flooding etc if an extension is built without appropriate safeguards and professional input. Once again, as I mentioned in my comments on the earlier application, this is not part of my formal objection but, given that we all live in the same conservation area, I am both surprised and disappointed at the way that this proposed extension work by Norden Neale and the owner of 28 Parliament Hill has been handled: first, by attempting to do the work without any planning permission and to this day making no attempt at all to discuss the plans/protections with their immediate neighbours in Oakford Court who are, I think, quite understandably, worried about the whether this extension work is safe and environmentally sound.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/0396/P	THE HEATH & HAMPSTEAD SOCIETY	23/03/2023 16:22:05	OBJNOT	OBJECTION From: THE HEATH & HAMPSTEAD SOCIETY

This application to add a mansard and dormers to the top of a semi-detached house is totally different from the existing gabled steep, slated, decorative quality of roofs in this part of the Conservation Area.

Unfortunately, in 1959, permission was given for the existing gabled roof to be removed and replaced with an extra floor with a flat roof - totally discordant with the other half of the pair (no. 30) and also with the neighbouring roofscape. This was years before the area was declared a Conservation Area and such a shocking change would certainly not be approved today.

All the existing Victorian houses are stated as contributing to the CA (surprisingly including no 28). However, the Conservation Area Statement also states in 'Current Issues' that the area suffers from:

- unfortunate roof extensions and changes &
- elevational alterations.

Both apply to no 28.

Another essential part of the character of the area is that it is composed of symmetrical pairs of semi detached houses. The flat roof and the small 1st floor windows of no. 28 are very different from no. 30 and spoil the pair.

The proposed mansard and dormers are unacceptable and detract seriously from the Conservation Area.

Please refuse.

However, with careful design it should be possible to reintroduce the gabled roof and the first floor windows, create a harmonious elevation with no.30 - and also construct the extra floor area suggested by the application.
