Rudall Crescent Residents' Association

17 Rudall Crescent London NW3 1RR

6th April 2015

For the attention of Angela Ryan, Marlene Dike, & David Glasgow Development Control & Planning Dept London Borough of Camden Argyle Street London WC1H 8ND

Dear Planners

Planning Applications: 2015/ 1348/P and 2015/1441/P

I am writing on behalf of a number of our members who object to the proposals in the above two planning applications. The paperwork submitted does not make it sufficiently clear that both these applications are for retrospective planning permission since the changes now sought were actually made some time ago without planning permission having been sough or obtained.

2015/1348/P - bin storage, fencing and new paving

The plans provided are incorrectly marked since what is designated as existing no longer exists and what is marked as proposed has already been built. It is our contention that the design of the new fencing and bin storage is wholly incompatible with the design and colours appropriate for a Victorian property and in such a prominent position in the streetscape. This, as you know, is contrary to Camden's planning regulations for the Conservation Area. We have no objection to the new paving which is an improvement on what was there before nor to the sedum roof on the bin storage. We think that the bin storage should ideally be replaced with materials and a design including finishing colour which IS in keeping with the house and surrounding properties. At the very least the whole arrangement should be painted dark green to make its bulk as unobtrusive and inconspicuous as possible.

2015/1441/P – finish to dormer window on top floor

As with the above application this application also fails to make it clear that it is retrospective since the dormer window on the front elevation is now a completely different colour and finish from the rest of the windows on the front elevation. The dormer was originally painted white, thus matching the rest of the windows at the front. The previous (granted) planning application indicated that like would be replaced with like – as required by Camden's planning rules for the Conservation Area. The varnished windows are totally out of keeping with the rest of the house

and look very peculiar and inappropriate for a Victorian property. The varnished finish has also been used on several new very large new windows on the rear elevation – also without planning permission. However it is the front elevation which causes particular offence given its prominent position and the sheer incompatibility of the finish with the rest of the house.

The architect is the son of the owner of the property and although young and inexperienced he must know that he is required to abide by the planning rules for the Conservation Area. We urge you to take enforcement action on both applications..

Best wishes

Yours sincerely

Jenny Stevens Planning Rep

Cc Chair, Rudall Crescent RA