

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7956/P	John Cottrell	Flat 3 56 Regents Park Road London NW1 7SX	04/02/2015 11:17:18	OBJ	<p>Both the drawings and the Design and Access statement refer to a rear extension of the neighbouring property, 56 Regents Park Road. The implication is that the proposed rear extension at 54 simply brings it into alignment with its neighbour. For example, paragraph 7.6: "The top of the parapet of the new rear extension is intended to match the line of the adjacent extension of the adjoining neighbour's (56 Regents Park Road)". This is somewhat misleading, since no such extension exists at 56, as can be seen clearly from 'Aerial photograph 2' in the Design and Access statement.</p> <p>The proposed rear extension at 54 is larger than anything nearby, and one side wall is shown as a party wall, straddling the property boundary with 56, which would necessitate access from the garden of 56 for future maintenance, as well as for construction. This will create a nuisance for the neighbours that persists after initial building work is complete. We request that the side wall of any permitted rear extension be pulled away from the property boundary by 0.9m, to allow construction and maintenance from within the grounds of 54. This is the proposed arrangement between 54 and 52 and was also the arrangement between 50 and 52, when a rear extension was built at number 50.</p> <p>Even when pulled away from the boundary, the proposed side wall of the rear extension would present the neighbours with a very large area of materials that are unsympathetic to the the existing rear elevations. Try to visualise the appearance from the garden of 56: approximately 1.6m high garden wall of brick above which is a 1.6m high wall of white painted render on top of which is a further 1.5m of opaque glass. A total height of 4.7m extending some 5m into the garden. We request that the face of any permitted side wall, which is not visible from 54, be constructed of London stock brick, to match the existing rear elevations and so mitigate its impact.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7956/P	(Mrs) Rachel Cottrell	56 Regents Park Road Ground Floor Flat (2) London NW1 7SX	15/02/2015 17:36:15	OBJEMAIL	<p>I am the tenant of the (raised) Ground Floor flat in 56 Regents Park Road and am the 83 year-old mother of the owner, John Cottrell. My living room and bedroom adjoin the party wall with Number 54. Outside my bedroom window is a small balcony, just big enough to accommodate a chair, and this is my only accessible outdoor area. (The balcony may be seen on the photographs of the rear of the properties in the planning application.)</p> <p>The proposed 3 metre extension proposed for the rear of number 54, coming right onto the party garden wall, would bring its terrace alongside my balcony at the same height, and change my existing clear view of gardens to a blank rendered side wall topped by frosted glass, which might give privacy (whose?) but would not deaden sound at all. If the extension has to be made I would prefer the side wall to be of brick to the full height, and set back from the boundary wall. This would at least deaden sound, and its maintenance would not require access to the garden of 56, necessitating the disturbance of the tenants in the garden flat below me.</p> <p>I do find it sad that the existing charming rear elevation of 54 is to be replaced by such a large and brutalist extension, so I am objecting to the loss of privacy and the ensuing noise nuisance. I would also draw your attention to the fact that there is no extension to the back of 56, as claimed in the planning application paragraph 7.6. (A previous owner submitted an application but then withdrew it.)</p> <p>I also object to the covering of the whole house in off-white paint, which will not be as attractive as the existing pastel colour which is such a feature of this stretch of Regent's Park Road, and has been carefully coordinated with neighbouring households.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7956/P	Prof Dame Celia Hoyles & Prof Richard Noss	52 Regents Park Road Ground and First floor London NW1 7SX	09/02/2015 06:38:41	OBJ	<p>We object to the application for planning permission on the following grounds:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise 2. Overlooking/loss of privacy 3. Effect on listed building and conservation area 4. Loss of trees <p>Our objection is to the extent of the extension of terrace at rear upper ground floor level: we do not object to the principle of an extension. Number 50 have a rear extension, as do we, at 52, both at ground level only. Ours at 52 was constructed after theirs at 50. We were required by Camden planning NOT to extend beyond the limit set at 50. This was to ensure that a) there was no undue level of overlooking the exterior ground floor level of adjoining properties thus breaching their privacy, and b) the extensions were architecturally coherent and consistent with the more stringent emphasis on conservation in more recent planning policy in Camden. We fail to see why this should not apply in the case of the extension proposed by number 54. We therefore request the extension is restricted in depth to that at 52 and 50. We object to the present plans. In more detail we object under the headings below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise: A present amenity of the houses on this part of Regents Park Road is the quiet back gardens, which are very long for the area and therefore deliver an unusually quiet and special environment for a built up area. The current plans propose a full-size terrace on top of the proposed extension. This terrace will provide, effectively, a large outside room, big enough for gatherings, tables and chairs etc, which will sit just above the gardens of 52 and 56. The impact of potential noise of parties, gatherings etc. on neighbouring properties – both gardens and indoors – is potentially substantial. 2. Privacy: The extension is proposed to be above the party wall height, and the proposed staircase is above the party-wall height thus providing views of 52 flats at basement and ground level. The extension could easily be set back as we were required to do in 52, and at 50 and as specified by Camden authorities in the construction of the extension at 52 as mentioned above. <p>The new ground floor extension will project out beyond the height of the brick boundary wall dividing 52 and 54 (the party wall). People standing on this terrace will have a direct line of vision into the interior of 52. Furthermore the proposed new staircase will give a similar view at its upper levels. At the moment with the exception of one small projecting side window – the occupants of 54 cannot see into 52. The proposed extension would be a considerable invasion of privacy inside the basement of 52. A much smaller set back terrace, in line with that at 50 and 52 would be reasonable, surely, and in line with the nature of the area.</p> <p>We have a small paved area in our garden one-third of the way down the garden which we use for eating in summer. At the moment it is completely secluded by trees in 52 and 54. The proposed extension and loss of the relevant trees will allow untrammelled sight of this area.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Visual Amenity & Conservation Area : The new terrace will project above the boundary wall of 52/54 and will represent a significant change to the visual amenity of the old wall, the open space and

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

light currently enjoyed. As we say above, we will not object to a smaller extension.

Generally this proposal represents a considerable increase in apparent scale of a brick ground floor extension and balcony than anything else that can be seen from the garden of 52. The proposal seems inconsistent with consents given for previous smaller extensions or less obtrusive extensions which were respectful of neighbours amenities (please note that the work in 2013 to Flat A is for some reason not included in the applicant's Design and Access Statement but involved a much smaller extension with a set back balcony provided for the ground floor flat).

In addition, the plans proposed for terraces and balconies at other levels at various levels are not in keeping with the visual amenity and reasonable requirements of a conservation area. They will also create additional privacy issues for all of the residents in no 52. In particular the top floor terrace will overlook directly the residents of the top floor flat.

4. Trees. There are at least 2 lime trees running along the party wall in the garden which, as far as we can see, are not noted and would have to be destroyed. This will impact on the paved area noted in 2 above.

We wish to be informed of the committee date when this application is considered.
