



Dear Ms Miller,


RE: Planning Application 2014/3211/P

We are writing to register our objection to the above planning application. This is a revised version of the application to add an additional storey to 7-9 Perrin's Court Hampstead, which was rejected by Camden last year. Although the revised proposal goes some way towards addressing the residents' concerns, in our view it is still unacceptable in both scale and height. Perrin's Court is one of Hampstead's quaintest old alleyways. If the application is approved not only will it be overwhelmed by a structure that is totally out of keeping with its surroundings, but the occupants of number premises both there and in the surrounding streets will suffer from overlooking and reduced levels of daylight.

We therefore strongly urge Camden to reject the application.

Yours sincerely,

Dr C.R. and Mr D.J. Pullen



> I am the owner of 12 Perrins Lane.

> I have reviewed the revised proposals, including the elevations, design and access statement. However, the proposed development still fails to address the reasons for its original refusal. Granting consent for this development would clearly compromise the character of Perrins Court, which is highlighted as a key street within the Conservation Area Statement for Hampstead. The proposed development fails to preserve the historical and architectural character of the street and would be to the detriment of the properties and ambience of the area. This street would be completely dominated by this large, high extension which would severely restrict the sunlight in the whole street. In addition to this the new extension in Perrins Court would also have a major detrimental affect on Perrins Lane which is also a street of great historical and architectural importance. The whole character of the area will be changed by this large intrusive extension.

This being so and considering the age of the surrounding buildings, I suspect that there is a right to light issue under the prescription act 1832. The proposal has not considered this.

> In conclusion, this proposal is completely inappropriate in terms of the preservation and enhancement of the character of this historic area and its impact would be wholly deleterious to the historical character that is an important part of Hampstead's heritage.

>

> Comments from John Barker, 12 Perrins Lane, NW3 1QY



>

Sent from my iPad

30th June 2014

Ms Rachel Miller--Planning Department
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Argyle Street
LONDON
WC1H 9JE

BY E-MAIL ONLY

Dear Ms Miller

re : 7-9 PERRIN'S COURT LONDON NW3 1QS – Your ref 2014/3211/P

I am joint-owner, and occupier, of 10-12 Perrin's Court to which I moved in 1976 and from which I have conducted my architectural practice ever since.

Thank you for the notification of the above application -- which I was amazed to receive as this shows scant regard for your refusal of application ref 2013/5170/P submitted less than a year ago.

Having again carefully considered this fresh application, the objections to the previous scheme apply in almost their entirety.

To save you having to refer back to my previous submission,, I summarise again my objections on the following grounds with reference to your own Council's published criteria and guidelines.

Conservation Area Statement + UDP

These documents define the main issues to be taken into consideration. The current application offends these by virtue of its :-

- (i) Bulk, massing and height which will result in the building being out of scale;
- (ii) It will impact negatively on the local streetscape and views;
- (iii) It shows a lack of respect for the historical context;
- (iv) The quite inappropriate copper cladding and roof erodes the quality of design of the building and of the roofscape;
- (v) The materials are ill-matching;

The additional storey, windows and roof terrace on the Perrin's Court frontage will invade the privacy through overlooking or perceived overlooking on the Perrin's Court properties to the front (north); the blank elevation to the rear (south) will affect the visual amenity of both residents and users of the Perrin's Lane properties to the rear (south).

Guideline EN31 (and UDP Policy H5) require development to 'preserve or enhance' the 'special character' of the Conservation Area; it is submitted that the proposals fail this test.

UDP H21 again require development to 'enhance' and 'respect the built form and historic context of the area, local views....existing features such as roof lines, elevational design....'

UDP H31 advises against any development which will be detrimental to the 'form and character' of the existing building'; the prominent roof may clearly thus be defined.

LB Camden 'Planning Guidance 'Design CPG1'

This document clearly indicates, again, that any development should

- (i) positively enhance,
- (ii) respect,
- (iii) avoid overshadowing,
- (iv) avoid overlooking and degree of openness and furthermore
- (v) 'roof additions ... are unacceptable ... in a building design' which as a complete composition 'would be undermined'.

It is submitted that the proposals fall below each one of the above criteria.

Applicant's agent's Design and Access Statement

Contrary to what is stated or implied:-

- (i) The 2012 approval related to change of use of the existing first floor and comprised internal alterations; there was no question of an additional storey.
- (ii) The existing building was quite clearly built in the 1960s and not in the 'early to mid- 20th century'.
- (iii) Contrary to what has been stated, the proposed 'form and width of the extension' *do not*, 'relate to the neighbouring buildings by adapting its form from the non-interference on daylight to the houses behind'. The sections clearly indicate the contrary.
- (iv) The design will *not* 'reduce to a minimum the impact of daylight received by the houses on Perrin's Lane behind' nor does the recess to the front, to the south east of Perrin's Lane, *in any way* 'prevent any overshadowing on the street below' -- indeed, it can be seen that the contrary is very much the case.
- (v) the extension is wholly inappropriate to the 'complete composition' of the 60s design of the existing building.
- (vi) The design bears no relationship to that of the original building.
- (vii) Likewise, it is submitted that
 - a. the design will not 'improve and enhance the Conservation Area';
 - b. the new 'roof form' is not 'contextual' and
 - c. the development will most certainly affect 'the amenity of neighbouring buildings'.

Further, it is noted with some surprise that again no Daylight and Sunlight Impact Statement was provided with the application, nor subsequently requested by you as Planning authority, so as to demonstrate the effect of the proposals on the adjoining properties and pedestrian areas.

Sections C – C and D – D on application Drawing No 701-002 are incorrectly drawn.

The absence of a section through the balustrade to the terrace on the Perrin's Court elevation is also noted. Furthermore, the provision of full height doors to the bedrooms at each end of the proposed new second floor flat suggests that the roof terrace will lend itself very simply to extension along the entire Perrin's Court frontage.

I trust it is evident from the above and the proposals viewed in their context, that the proposed development will ruin the ambience and streetscape of Perrin's Court, one of the most pleasant pedestrian areas within the heart of Hampstead village and its Conservation Area.

It will create a tunnel effect to the great detriment of the visual amenity of the many visitors to Hampstead, to the residents and offices to the south and to the residents, offices and shops to the north.

It will affect especially the outdoor seating to the cafe at No 12, which will be robbed of its sunlight and daylight, probably undermining its viability, leading to its closure and its constant year-round attraction of pedestrians into Perrin's Court.

It will also impact on the offices over depriving them of the daylight and sunlight that the building has enjoyed for well over 200 years. It will convert Perrin's Court into 'Perrin's Alley'.

Please note that I shall be pleased to arrange access to buildings adjoining and facing the application site at any time during normal working hours for the site inspection which will, no doubt, form part of your appraisal of this application.

Finally, the large numbers of objectors to this application wish to be advised as to when the application goes to committee so that they can exercise their right to be represented and present the objections personally to members; kindly let us know when the application is due for consideration.

Thanking you,

Yours sincerely,

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the sender.

cc planning@camden.gov.uk

MARESFIELD GARDENS INC.

PLEASE REPLY TO:
THE SECRETARY OF MARESFIELD GARDENS INC.
P.O. BOX 464, 8700 KUESNACHT, SWITZERLAND

BY E-MAIL

Camden Council Planning
London

2 July 2014 / mra

planning@camden.gov.uk

Dear Sirs

OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION 2014/3211/P 7-9 PERRIN'S COURT, LONDON NW3

In our capacity as owner of flat 10 Village Mount Perrin's Court, we wish to object to the above application for the following reasons:

1. Impact on light and view.
2. Plans may have scaled down but still significantly will change the skyline view.
3. Impact on the quality of life of the residents.
4. Perrins Court is a key street within the conservation area and the development fails to enhance the character of the street and would be detrimental.
5. The tunneling effect closing in on Perrin's Court.

Yours sincerely,

For and on behalf of Maresfield Gardens Inc

