

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3130/P	paul grosvenor	02/12/2023 12:14:49	COMMNT	<p>The front entrance elevation proposed for wheel chair access shows that the front stairs to be cut in half and a glass lift lift will replace the lost part.</p> <p>This is a major alteration that will substantially alter the look of the building. This group of houses (44-54 King Henry's Road) have been given a grade II listing due to the uniqueness (no such builds exist elsewhere in London) Secod World damage bombing damage destroyed the majority of these houses.</p> <p>The proposed alterations to the front elevation is totally out of keeping with the historic nature of these few remaining houses and to allow permission is architural vandalism.</p> <p>The reason for the plan is understable however unecessary i have friends who are wheel chair users who with two people can easily ascend and descend the front stairs which are shallow. If this is untenable a ramp could be used..</p> <p>Camden ought to acknowledge the architectural greatness of the city and not take planning decisions that compromise this.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3130/P	Jonathan Gibbins	02/12/2023 23:16:33	OBJ	<p>As a general observation, the modifications appear to prioritise the development of a larger basement flat for renting out, with an unsightly and intrusive corralled patio at the back, over maintaining a pleasant lower ground floor kitchen/dining room with access to the garden, and keeping generous meeting space on the entrance floor for parochial and family functions. Agreed, though, a toilet on the upper ground floor makes sense; perhaps this could be positioned just to the side of the entrance lobby, cutting into the current study. And perhaps a tea-making station might be added to the living room. The small existing basement flat makes a nice starter home for a young person or couple.</p>

With respect to some of the details in the proposed modifications:

Would it not be possible to keep the study larger and less interrupted by entrances, by positioning the toilet just to the left of the vicarage entrance, where the lobby is shown as being enlarged with two chairs? Then the two coat closets could be placed instead along the N-S wall where the sink of the proposed toilet is shown. This would retain more of the alcoves either side of the chimney-breast. There would then be only one door into the study, opposite the stairs leading upstairs (and also the sliding doors into the dining area).

I would prefer a stair lift that would keep the proportions of the entry-way stairs as they are now rather than a vertical lift. The proposed vertical partially obscures the front door and results in the left ascending handrail going up the 'middle' of the natural stairway line. A stair lift would serve most users unable to climb the entry stairs. The space that the lift allows access to is limited to one floor only and does not appear to have a wheelchair-accessible toilet. The church is nearby with full wheelchair access if required. I do appreciate the retention of the portico.

The air source heat pump (ASHP) is shown in the incorrect place in both proposed front elevations. As shown in the proposed basement plan it is closer to the boundary wall with the adjacent property. I am slightly concerned about noise from the ASHP and wonder why the Camden guidelines to place it as far as possible from adjacent properties were not followed. The covering letter mentions 'two air source heat pumps' but only one appears to be shown in the drawings, labelled in the proposed side elevation as 'New Air Source Heat Pump for Vicarage'. Given the mistakes made in the front elevations and the confusion as to whether one or two ASHPs are being installed I would like to be consulted if another ASHP is, in fact, being installed.

The solar panels being angled above the flat roof adds to the visual clutter from adjacent buildings and should be restricted. If inclined panels are used then they should be oriented with their shorter axes aligned N-S to limit their vertical elevation. Please could this vertical elevation be specified to not exceed, say, 35cm?

In fact, completely flat panels would give only 10% less output than panels at the 15 degrees suggested and in practice this penalty will be even less if, as appears possible, the panels were to cast shadows on other panels from their proposed raised ends (<https://solarfast.co.uk/blog/best-solar-panel-angle/>).

It may be planned anyway, but I request that the glazing in all of the side windows be obscured glass for mutual privacy.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3130/P	Bridget Grosvenor	02/12/2023 11:03:38	OBJ	<p>The objection to this planning application is the installation of a wheel chair access to the front exterior of the house.</p> <p>The planned alteration is not sympathetic to the nature of these historic historic houses. The vicarage (44 King Henry's Road) has has ample room for entertainment along with wheelchair access at St Mary's church just up the road .</p> <p>The diocese had originally planned to sell the property to allow the vicarage to be relocated to a more suitable property for disabled access this would be a more sensible outcome reducing building work and the inevitable noise associated with it. This area has already being blighted by the HS2 construction to the rear of these properties and it is unfair to continue with with more disruption.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3234/P	Peter Newman	11/12/2023 14:58:09	INT	<p>My wife and I are owners of 92 South Hill Park, which lies between 90 South Hill Park and 94 South Hill Park. We cannot tell from the application what is being proposed in terms of works or how this will affect our property. We would ask that the application be supplemented with drawings to allow us to see what is contemplated before this is approved.</p>
