

Camden Council Customer feedback and enquiries
Comments on a current Planning Application - Ref. 9095716

Planning Application Details

Year 2013

Number 7124

Letter P

Planning application address 1 Regents Park terrace

Title Mr.

Your First Name Collin

Initial

Last Name Darlington

Organisation

Comment Type Object

Postcode

Address line 1 15 Hatchard Road

Address line 2

Address line 3

Postcode N19 4NG

Your comments on the planning application

The revised plans for the proposals whereby the parapast wall heights are increased are even worse than the previous scheme in relation to the impact the development makes on the nature of the conservation area. The scheme continues to be out of keeping with the surrounding area and of poor architectural quality.

Even though the garage doors are being 'retained' the stairs to the upper level have a landing and lobby and so appear to be the first step in the development operating as a separate property.

The proposal should be rejected


Planning Application Details

If you wish to upload a file containing your comments then use the link below

No files attached

About this form

Issued by	Camden Council Customer feedback and enquiries Camden Town Hall Judd Street London WC1H 9JE
Form reference	9095716



To: Peres Da Costa, David
Cc: Planning
Subject: logged Planning Application 1 Regents Park Terrace; 2013/7124/P
Categories: Orange Category

Dear David

I am writing to object to this application, as I wrote previously to express my concern about the former application (2013/4459/P) for this site.

I understand there is little change in the detail of the proposals from the previous application - which officers rejected.

I can't see that what changes are proposed address the Council's previous reasons for rejection, so I would ask that it be rejected again.

I can't access my previous email but please could you locate this and ensure it is taken into account in assessing this new application.

The key points I made as I recall are:

#This is a prominent site, in a sensitive conservation area: the experts on the area (the PHCAAC) have objected and so I support their views; #Any development in a conservation area has - within Camden's agreed policies - to 'enhance' the built environment; within this distinguished architectural context this undistinguished proposal fails to offer any enhancement; #The residential use of this garage site is bound to add to pressure on local parking which is already in short supply; #the proposals ignore Camden's policy requirement for 'lifetime homes' design; #The latest proposal has an even greater impact on the neighbouring property and garden, with a near 50% increase in the brick wall area facing No 70. Not only does this intrude on the amenity of the residents at No 70, it also will disadvantage the recognised historic garden there by reducing natural light.

I am not against infill development of this kind per se, providing it is sensitive to neighbours and to the built context. Sadly this proposal seems to be neither.

Kind regards

Chris



(If you are contacting me on an LGiU matter please email chris.naylor@lgiu.org.uk)

This email is from a Blackberry - please excuse brevity/limited format.

[REDACTED]

Sent: 31 December 2013 11:34
To: Planning
Subject: logged for the attention of Frances Wheat Director of planning
Categories: Orange Category

Dear Frances Wheat,

Here is a copy of the email I am sending David Da Peres Costa about the planning application below.

Kind regards,

Lucy Gent

[REDACTED]

Below are my comments on this planning application. I look forward to your making a site visit.

As regards the consultation process, Camden has a good reputation for observing the rules, but on this occasion there are anomalies.

1. Camden did not advertise the second planning application locally. This seems unfair. The consultation period should, even now, be extended.
2. Further, when later on the applicant put in a revised plan (Amended Roof Form), some of those who sent in comments before did not receive notice of this. Thus they were not able to bring their comments up to date.
3. As the revised plan came in very late – my letter from Camden is dated 17 December and it took a couple of days to reach me – some people would, like the head of Camden Planning, have gone away for a Christmas break returning on 6 January. Thus they would not have been in a position to comment. Is such a late submission of a revised plan, sent in immediately before the major holiday of the year, fair play?

Yours sincerely,

Lucy Gent
70 Gloucester Crescent,
London NW1 7EG

cc Frances Hearst, Camden Planning Director

[REDACTED]

Sent: 27 December 2013 16:47
To: Planning
Cc: Planning
Subject: logged Application Proposal 2013.7124/P

Categories: Orange Category

The Flat,
70 Gloucester Crescent,
London, NW1 7EG
27 December 2013

Dear David Peres Da Costa,

Following our brief conversation of the telephone, I am now sending in my response to

Planning Application 2013/7124/P

First, a brief point about the Revised and Amended plans which I received on the 19th December. According to this, we had 14 days from the date of the letter (17 Dec. 2103) in which to comment on this on any other aspects of this application. May I point out that, as the remaining twelve days covered the Christmas period when many people are away, we were not being offered a realistic amount of time to deal properly with these amended plans. Secondly, I learnt by chance this morning that a couple of residents in the street, who **received the initial planning letter were never sent the Amended Plans.** I do not know if this applied to others, but it needs checking. **I am confident this error will be rectified, as Camden has a good reputation for following correct procedures. It will make necessary a further extension to the deadline so that interested parties can be fully informed, or correct procedures will not have been met.**

Could you please also **replace those application details which appear to have been taken down from the current application.** No reason is given for their disappearance, and, as we are permitted, according to the Amended Plans letter, to comment on **any** aspect of the Planning Application until 31 December, it does not help to have blank pages where drawings once were. **The disappearance of certain drawings and information again makes it necessary to request a proper period of consultation.**

There were six objections to this Application Proposal in its previous form. Many remain unaltered by this new submission, and surely, from a construction engineering point of view, a crucial document is still missing? My comments are as follows:

Camden Council is rightly proud of its policies regarding historic neighbourhoods. The application seeks to undermine the Council's achievement by proposing to place an inappropriate, style-less, two-storey building at a critical juncture between two magnificent terraces: Gloucester Crescent and Regent's Park Road. Together, both terraces form a unit, with the spaces for the gardens creating an integral part of the whole. The front door to No 1 Regent's Park Road is placed round the side of the house so that it and its portico face on to Gloucester Crescent. It reinforces the magnificent vista of one terrace ending and another beginning. Buildings, spaces and gardens cohere. The proposed two-storey building is out-of proportion with, and wholly unsuited to its architectural setting. It would interrupt the rationale that informs the existing view and would destroys a unique architectural experience - available to all who walk or drive down the street. It would also damage Camden's reputation as a forward-looking and not negligent council. **On all these grounds – aesthetic, historical, visual and political – I object to this planning application.**

The new drawings for the North East Elevation show that 70 Gloucester Crescent would be faced with more than a 30% increase in the surface-area of brick, if the proposed building were to replace the existing garage. This is partly because the height of the walls has been increased so as to hide much of the roof. The result is a significantly more obtrusive building, and though certain features that were objected to before have been removed, it remains anodyne and out of kilter with the architectural language and proportions of the terraced houses on either side of it. (If there is a real need for additional accommodation to this five-storey house, then it would be far more appropriate to build onto the northeast side of the house at ground and lower ground floor level. This would be much less obtrusive to their neighbours and to the wider public who enjoy the experience of the Crescent. It would also make for a safer and more secure build.)

The immediate impact on the existing proposal and new amendments on the two neighbouring houses will be a **severe loss of light**. This will be particularly **detrimental to the amenities and plants** at 70 Gloucester Crescent which already suffers greatly from the sheer height of Regent's Park Terrace. This Planning Proposal will significantly reduce further the light and sunlight that comes into the garden from the south east. The proposed new building will come forward towards the road a metre more than the existing garage. It pushes forward just where afternoon sunlight comes in to the garden. The proposed building would also be considerably taller and bulkier than the existing garage and will be depressingly overbearing. It will obstruct and damage the main view from the three main floors of 70 Gloucester Crescent and even from the lower-ground-floor kitchen window. In addition, this planning proposal shows scant respect for its impact, not just on immediate neighbours but the wider community, including those who visit the street in connection with literary or architectural walking tours, or the garden at No 70 Gloucester Crescent, created by the present and past owners, both landscape gardeners, and where visitors sometimes arrive in coach-loads, either on pre-planned visits or during those days when the garden is open to the public under the National Gardens Scheme. It is a recognised local amenity, of considerable value in this inner suburb. **I therefore object further to this proposal on the grounds of damage to amenities and loss of light and of sunlight to residents, visitors and plants.**

One former objection to the planning proposal rested on the grounds that it would contribute to parking stress and congestion. The applicant's reply to this made mention of the two private parking bays of which s/he has the use of on Regent's Park Road. This does not, however, remove the objection, for a problem will still be presented by an increase in cars related to the use of the proposed ancillary dwelling, which will be exacerbated by the loss of the existing drive, already in occasional use by the current owners as is the public parking bay on Gloucester Crescent outside the main house. **I further object to this planning proposal on the grounds that it offends against Policies CS11, CS19 and DP18 within Camden's Framework Core Strategy and Local Development Frameworks.**


I note also that the information supplied on construction management is still vague or incorrect. The assurance that 'the neighbouring gardens will be undisturbed' is not possible given that one side wall of the proposed building is also the continuous garden wall which divides 70 Gloucester Crescent off from the gardens of Nos 1,2,3 and 4 Regent's Park Terrace. It was never built to be a load-bearing wall and is in need, at the very least, of re-pointing. It should also be noted that this wall is affected by the Party Wall Act of 1996.

Finally, it is necessary to point to two further falsehoods in the application proposal. Firstly, it states: 'During then design process we consulted with the owners of both neighbouring properties at No 2 Regent's Park Terrace and No 70 Gloucester Crescent.' This is incorrect. The residents at 70 Gloucester Crescent would have welcomed consultation during the design process, but were not shown any designs until the finished plans were in place in July 2013. Even then there was no possibility of discussion, for an immediate attempt was made to coerce them into agreement. Secondly, the proposal states: 'The garage currently has a large clear glass window' causing No 70 Gloucester Crescent 'a loss of privacy, light pollution from the garage and established rights of light'. This is disingenuous: the glass is opaque and very grimy; and on the garden side at 70 Gloucester Crescent, running across the window, is a wooden trellis which if often thickly covered by a creeper. The real loss privacy, etc., would that by the proposed ancillary building. **I further object to the Application Proposal on the grounds that these falsehoods make it an unreliable document.**

Please do not hesitate to contact me should any of these points need clarifying.

Yours sincerely,

Frances Spalding,

A large black rectangular box redacting the signature of Frances Spalding.

[REDACTED]

Sent: 09 January 2014 10:05
To: Planning
Subject: Application Ref: 2013/7124/P (1 Regents Park Terrace, NW1 7EE)

I'm re-forwarding this message in case it didn't reach the appropriate person before.
Many thanks
Tom Seligman

[REDACTED]

Date: Fri, 20 Dec 2013 12:12:48 +0000

Dear Mr Fowler,
I sent some comments about the above planning application in its previous form (2013/4459/P) but I'm not sure whether they arrived in time.
I hope that they can be considered now in relation to the revised application, which not only fails to address any of my concerns, but in fact seems intent on making some aspects worse (see my comment (2)), by altering the roof shape and raising the elevation further.
With all best wishes,
Tom Seligman

COMMENTS

I've lived at No.70 Gloucester Crescent for just over two years now, and use the garden a considerable amount: mainly for quiet, concentrated study (I am a professional musician). I have two main concerns about the proposed development.

(1) There will potentially be disturbing noise/music etc. coming from the new building when lived in. Since the building proposed is absolutely adjoining the garden, this can hardly fail to be an issue. (The application's claim that there will be no disturbance is hard to credit, while its claim that the current window is disturbing to us is entirely spurious.)

(2) The current wall of the garage is at a height which can reasonably be said to be the same as a high garden wall. If the overall structure is turned into something higher (which it would be, owing to the substantial added roof of the new building), that will fundamentally change, and the garden will be essentially be hemmed in by a building rather than naturally surrounded by appropriate boundary walls as at present.

Tom Seligman
70 Gloucester Crescent