

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/3211/P	Sophie Barker	Flat 14 Village Mount Perrin's Court	23/06/2014 20:15:40	COMNOT	<p>Having reviewed the proposals including the elevations and design and access statement, the proposed development doesn't truly address the reasons it was refused previously. Ultimately, granting consent for this development would compromise the character of perrins court, which is highlighted as a key street within the Conservation Area Statement for Hampstead. This development fails to preserve and enhance the character of the street and would be detrimental to the properties on perrins court as well as local businesses.</p> <p>The development would still have a harmful impact and contravene CS14 in promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage.</p> <p>The revised sectional drawings do not provide sufficient evidence that the daylight to the flats on perrins court will not be affected.</p> <p>Considering the age of the surrounding buildings, I would suspect there is also a right to light issue under the prescription act 1832. The proposal has not considered this.</p> <p>The privacy issue will still affect the upper floor flats to village mount.</p> <p>In conclusion , this proposal is completely inappropriate in terms of the preserving and enhancing the character of perrins court. It's impact would have irreversible damage on the homes and businesses on one of hampstead's most important streets.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/3211/P	Jessica Learmond-Criqui	14A Redington Road London NW3 7RG	21/06/2014 00:23:36	OBJ	Dear Ms Miller,  Planning application - 2014/3211/P Site Address 7-9 Perrin"s Court London NW3 1QS

I am a resident of Hampstead.

I object to this application to erect a mansard roof extension to create 2 x 1-bed residential flats (Class C3) at this site for the following reasons:

(a) It contravenes the London Borough of Camden Conservation Area Statement—Hampstead in that:

1. The design:

(i) is of an ‘inappropriate bulk, massing and/or height’

(ii) will have an adverse impact upon views for the flats behind the development and the space above the building which lends a pleasant amenity to Perrins Court – and which enhances its character - will be lost forever;

(iii) demonstrates a lack of ‘good manners’ or respect to the historical context’ of this lovely passage;

2. Quality erosion - The design shows ‘little respect to their historic context’ and is an “inappropriate extension” to the building;

3. Roof alterations - The roof alterations result are not an ‘appropriate context for the proposals’ because the scheme closes gaps between period buildings to each side;

4. Topography + development - The additional storey is likely to cause an invasion of privacy through overlooking as well as affect the scale of Perrins Court;’

5. UDP Policies:

- EN31 – this development does not “preserve or enhance the special character of this conservation area”.

- H5 +21 – the design does not “preserve or enhance the Conservation Area”.

- H21 – the design does not “respect the built form and historic context of the area including the local views”

- H31 – the design has a harmful “impact” and is “detrimental to the form and character of the existing building”.

(b) It contravenes the London Borough of Camden ‘Planning Guidance ‘Design CPG1’ in that the design is not a good design and does not succeed in having the following effects which are required by this planning guidance, namely, ‘positively enhance’, ‘respect’, ‘avoid overshadowing’ ‘consider overlooking’ and ‘degree of openness’. The roof additions are unacceptable and this building design and as a complete composition which would be undermined.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>(c) In relation to the Design and Access Statement which forms part of the application, I make the following comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Last year's approval related to internal alterations the existing first floor only.</li> <li>2. The existing building was built in the 60s, not 'early to mid-20th century' as stated.</li> <li>3. The proposed mansard is 'traditional' but wholly inappropriate to the context of the 60s design.</li> <li>4. The fenestration does NOT match that below.</li> <li>5. Contrary to what is written</li> </ol> <p>The design will NOT 'improve and enhance the conservation area', the new 'roof form' is NOT 'contextual' AND it DOES affect 'the amenity of neighbouring buildings'. For these reasons, I urge Camden Council to reject the plans outright. If the plans are passed by Camden, I call on the Planning Committee to reject the plans.</p>
2014/3211/P	Timothy Goss JP	5 Perrin's Court London NW3 1QS	15/06/2014 10:57:26	OBJ	<p>This second attempt at ruining Perrin's Court does not answer the objections that resulted in the Mansard roof proposal being thrown out last year.</p> <p>To start with - AND MOST IMPORTANTLY - the proposal does not take into account how it will affect the west side of No 5, the house next door, arguably the prettiest cottage in Perrin's Court. The plans ("conveniently"?) omit any drawings of No 5's roof and roof windows, (and for that matter, the windows overlooking the site in Perrin's Lane and Heath Street). The view from these windows, if planning was granted, would change from one overlooking the Hampstead sky line to (in No 5's case particularly), one of a confrontational "in-your-face" wall, not to mention the aesthetically damaged sky line and restriction of light. (Which also is not mentioned in the application).</p> <p>Furthermore the drainage from most of the current flat roof exists through no 5's system and we are not prepared (or designed) to take the additional drainage water that the proposed additional roof area would inevitably attract.</p> <p>The permission granted a few years ago to erect a stair well on the roof of No 3 (No 5's other neighbour on the east side) has since proved to be a far more obtrusive and unsightly erection to that that the original plans would have led one to believe, blocking light and views from No 5's top floor - it is essential that the same mistake is not repeated. This filling-in of No 5's only remaining open side would create a further intrusion and we most vehemently oppose it.</p> <p>Secondly, No 6 (which also would be severely affected by this proposal if it were granted) is currently empty - so the future owners will not be au-fait with the history of this debate. Also severely affected would be the owners / occupiers of Perrin's Lane and Heath Street, who back on to the proposed sight. Many of these rent from landlords who may not be aware of the application, and it is hoped that the Camden planning authority will recognise these peoples' obvious potential concerns when adjudicating in this matter.</p> <p>We will be sending photos under separate cover.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/3211/P	Jennie Walsh and John Usher	24 Perrin's Lane London NW3 1QY	23/06/2014 19:05:39	OBJ	<p>We wish to register our objection to planning application 2014/3211/P. Our reasons remain the same as those we made to the original application submitted last year, not least because we cannot see any significant change to the plans.</p> <p>We are resident's of 24 Perrin's Lane and are very concerned about the impact on our light and view should the applicants be allowed to build up at 7-9 Perrin's Court. We are also greatly worried about the impact on the light, rear views and privacy of our neighbours' properties immediately behind the proposed development. The revisions to the plans may have slightly scaled down the size of the development, but it remains a significant addition to the skyline.</p> <p>Our rear windows face Perrin's Court. We are overlooked by the properties in Village Mount, but are able to derive light and reasonable skyline views as a result of the low and medium level properties on the south side of Perrin's Court. Any upwards development will, we believe, greatly impact on that skyline view.</p> <p>The property at 7-9 Perrin's Court and its even lower-level neighbours were intentionally designed to retain a sense of light in a relatively narrow lane. We cannot understand the value of allowing a single flat to be built, in an important conservation area where there is no significant shortage of private accommodation, at the cost to the quality of life of local residents.</p>
2014/3211/P	Sophie Barker	Flat 14 Village Mount Perrin's Court	23/06/2014 20:11:53	COMNOT	<p>Having reviewed the proposals including the elevations and design and access statement, the proposed development doesn't truly address the reasons it was refused previously. Ultimately, granting consent for this development would compromise the character of perrins court, which is highlighted as a key street within Conservation Area Statement for Hampstead. This development fails to preserve and enhance the character of the street and would be detrimental to the properties on perrins court and local businesses.</p> <p>The development would still have a harmful impact and contravene CS14 in promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage.</p> <p>The revised sectional drawings do not provide sufficient evidence that the daylight to the flats on perrins court will not be affected.</p> <p>Considering the age of the surrounding buildings, I would suspect there is also a right to light issue under the prescription act 1832. The proposal has not considered this.</p> <p>The privacy issue will still affect the upper floor flats to village mount.</p> <p>In conclusion , this proposal is completely inappropriate in terms of the preserving and enhancing the character of perrins court. It's impact would have irreversible damage on the homes and businesses on one of hampstead's most important streets.</p>