

Application No:

2013/7124/P

Received:

01/01/2014 15:17:06

Comment:

OBJ

Response:

The proposed development remains an incongruous addition the existing building, No 1, Regents Park Terrace.

Viewpoints from which the developed garage would make an impact:

1 from the junction of Oval Road and Gloucester Crescent, as pedestrians approach Gloucester Terrace
It would have a negative impact on the existing high quality streetscape of this part of the Primrose Hill conservation area. The developed garage would become an unsightly addition at the start of the sweep of the listed terraces of Gloucester Crescent.

2 from the main entrance and garden of No 70 Gloucester Crescent (see below)

Garden of No 70 Gloucester Crescent

This is a noteworthy garden in London, particularly in the urban area of Camden Town. It is secluded, mature and has been designed to maximise the potential of its compact site. Its importance is shown by the large number of visitors, on the two or three annual openings for the National Gardens Scheme, as well as parties of specialist students at other times.

The garden is often an inspiration to visitors, who are able to see what can be achieved within a relatively small site. In addition, the space is a wildlife haven, visited by a range of garden birds and the native toad, Bufo bufo, which spawns in the pond most years.

Visual effects resulting from the proposed development.

Comments will not all fit into the space. Please see separate comment for remainder.

Application No:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2013/7124/P	01/01/2014 15:21:08	OBJ	<p>comment continued from previous form:</p> <p>Visual effects resulting from the proposed development.</p> <p>Overall, there will be a negative visual impact. The raised parapet, pitched roof and extended length of the building would dominate views within the garden:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i from the steps up to the front door; ii from the lawn, looking towards the pond and upper terrace iii from the seating area at the edge of the lawn <p>Loss of daylight/sunlight</p> <p>The proposed extended wall would overshadow the raised terrace above the pond, cutting down the daylight and sunlight it currently receives from its open aspect to the south. The extended parapet and pitched roof would reduce the amount of sunlight available in one of the main planting areas adjoining the boundary (garage) wall.</p> <p>Effect of the building process</p> <p>It is very likely that access would be needed to the existing garage wall, which forms part of the boundary wall of 70 Gloucester Crescent, during the works. This would inevitably lead to the destruction of the existing planting in this area.</p> <p>For all the above reasons, I trust that the development at 1 Regents Park Terrace will not be granted planning permission.</p>
2013/7124/P	02/01/2014 21:16:50	OBJ	<p>We registered our strong objections to the previous version of this application, and this very slightly revised scheme is if anything worse. The cynical proposal to rebuild the front wall further forward and include the garage doors is clearly an attempt to maintain that the elevation is effectively unaltered. The plans of the original application have not been changed, with the landing on the staircase in the same place and at the same level. So a small subsequent change to the garage doors would allow the access from the street as before. This scheme is totally unworthy of the street and the adjacent buildings.</p> <p>All the reasons given by the Council for the rejection of the first application still stand.</p>

Application No:

2013/7124/P

Received:

28/12/2013 11:15:20

Comment:

COMMNT

Response:

I received a letter dated 17 Dec on 20 Dec with your instruction to receive comment within 14 days of the date of the letter. That is, you were demanding a response by 31 December. Your demand for such a deadline at this time of year is outrageous. It has been Christmas, you know! Please, with just cause, consider extending the deadline

The intended change of use to make a residential outbuilding from this nondescript 50s-ish garage appended to this end of terrace jewel in one of the most important examples of regency architecture in the Borough, and quite possibly in the city, is simply ludicrous and offensive. That the current owner has chosen to so develop the interior of the home to reduce it to too few bedrooms to accommodate an elderly relative is deeply questionable as a premiss in her supporting argument. The house was formerly an annex to the then nearby convent and housed the overspill of nuns in the considerable complement of bedrooms the house then possessed. Surely some creative re-instatement of space within the residence could be made to meet the needs outlined.

The objections that I and a number of neighbours raised concerning the negative impact on the adjacent prize-winning garden, itself an important little oasis of tranquility in the neighbourhood and an asset to the borough, still remain and are not addressed by this revised plan. Particularly ignored is the impact of the build itself. The change of use to residential will also have the potential to invade the privacy of the use of the adjacent garden. While this might not currently be envisaged, there is no guarantee that a resident in the future would not impact more forcefully.

I think that the greatest improvement that could be made to the site, which clearly the owner no longer wishes to use as a garage, would be to remove the garage altogether and restore it to a larger and better endowed garden in keeping with its rich architectural origins!
