

From: Sophie Jolowicz
Sent: Mon Nov 11 17:32:43 2024
To: Planning
Subject: Planning application 2024/4195/P 30 Chalcot Road
Importance: Normal

Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html;

	You don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important	
--	--	--

[REDACTED]

30 Chalcot Road NW1 8LN 2024/4195/P Continued strong objection.

I second the comments from Richard Simpson (pasted below) and in addition I believe that the works they are doing to the rear of the house are heavy, bulky and will be unattractive to this inner courtyard. I live 29, Chalcot Road. Not only suffering the continued noise and dust (and damage to party wall) they have dug so deep down in the garden, I can assume the lower ground floor inside the house is the same, I hope structurally they have not affected our foundations.

I have already objected to the air conditioning unit requested against my balcony wall.

They seem to be developing a house out of character of the area. If they wanted such a huge ugly house with air conditioning why have they bought in a conservation area?

I am registering strongly my objection

We note that this is a further attempt to gain planning consent for the first floor rear extension, applied for previously in application 2024/0035/P, but withdrawn from that application. The Advisory Committee objected then on the following grounds:

**We object strongly to the rear addition of the first floor which destroys the original and surviving plan form and balance of the elevation at this level. The proposals go against the Primrose Hill Conservation Area statement (current SPD) at PH27 which states that 'extensions should be in harmony with the original form and character of the house.*

Our objection still stands.

We note that the applicants' arguments from other cases are not valid as precedents for this application, as follows.

proposed extension rising a stated 1220mm above the surviving closet wing, and thus destroying the balance of the elevation at this level.

28 Chalcot Road, PEX0100465, is not relevant since it refers to a lower ground floor extension, not a first floor extension, as well as a decision more than 20 years old.

14 Chalcot Square, 2005/5560/P, refers specifically to the replacement of changes from the 1960s, a circumstance not relevant to the current application.

24 Fitzroy Road, 2003/0875/P, the rear extensions were to replace existing rear extensions, not

the case in the current application, where the rear elevation wall is original to the house. We argue more generally that an individual case does not set a pattern. We are very concerned that individual cases responding to specific circumstances can be used as a general precedent.

Yours Sophie Jolowicz

Sent from my iPad