

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1988/P	Isobel Roele	14/06/2024 10:19:52	OBJ	<p>As a leasehold owner at the neighbouring property (upstairs flat at 158 Royal College Street), I object to this proposal to amend the development at 156 RCS (see Planning Application 2022/2112/P and Details of Application 2023/5364/P). The effect of the proposed amendment is to significantly alter the overall construction project in a way that was not contemplated when permission for the development was granted.</p> <p>Aside from the negative overall impact of the proposal (described in points 1-7 below), I note that the proposal itself is underdeveloped and contains inadequate information about its materials, construction, and implications.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The proposed extension appears to affect the first storey has been wrongly described as the “erection of single storey rear extension at second floor level”, but the plans appear to describe an extension at first floor level (i.e. one floor above ground-floor level). The proposal must be clarified before permission is granted. 2) The plans contain insufficient information about the roof of the proposed extension, which appears to be a flat roof. I strongly object to any design that contemplates, or would enable, the use of the roof as a second-floor outside terrace area, as it would seriously affect my enjoyment of my adjacent terrace, especially in terms of noise levels and loss of privacy. 3) The proposed extension constitutes an amendment to an existing planning permission granted at 156 RCS, the construction of which is currently underway. The original proposal stated that “There are no significant design changes to the mansard and rear extension” (Covering Letter to the original proposal, dated 13th May 2022). This extension constitutes a significant design change. 4) There is insufficient information about the aesthetic design of the proposed extension. A photograph in the plans of a similar building materials at Arlington Road suggests that the aesthetic is out of keeping with the surrounding area, which does not feature sheet-metal cladding. This will negatively impact on an area valued for its aesthetics, right next to the canal. I note that the planning permission to the original site design was granted on the condition that “All new external work shall be carried out in materials that resemble, as closely as possible, in colour and texture those of the existing building” (Point 3, Final Decision Notice). 5) The proposed extension would render the green sedum roof, which was a key condition of the original plans, nugatory. The original green roof scheme was set out in the Approval of Details application no. 2023/5364/P. The proposed extension seriously impacts on this scheme. A mere sliver of green roof would remain, which would have negligible impact on the area’s biodiversity. This contravenes Point 4 of the Final Decision Notice, which states that “Prior to commencement of development, full details in respect of the living roof in the area indicated on the approved roof plan shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority”. No amended plan setting out the planting and maintenance of the green roof has been submitted. 6) The proposed extension involves loss of daylight to the ground-floor dwelling, as it would be constructed in place of a skylight. No justification of this change is made in the proposal, which presumably impacts on the Sunlight and Daylight study made for the original proposal (2022/2112/P) 7) Building works from the overall 156 RCS development have consistently contravened the Control of Pollution Act 1974, as noisy works that can be heard beyond the boundary of the site regularly take place on Saturdays after 1pm. I have reported this several times to Camden Council, but any action has been taken by

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				the Council has not affected the site practices.
