

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/2074/P	PJ White	45 Princess Road	30/05/2015 15:39:47	OBJ	<p>I wish to oppose in the strongest possible way parts of this application,namely 1. the loss of retail on the ground floor, 2. the changes to the shopfront at ground floor level, and 3. the new basement single storey rear extension:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. This is a retail unit which forms part of the terrace of retail units continuing down Chalcot Road and should remain as such. the applicant will surely say that he cannot let the unit but he is trying to charge almost three times what a similar shop unit was let for this month further down Chalcot Road. The retail nature of the area is fragile and we cannot afford to lose a unit in this way. The retail units in Chalcot Road have been defended in refusing several previous recent planning applications and rightly so. this parade of shops has recently been improving and becoming a more lively retail parade. More retail use in the eleven shops is now evident than has been in the past thirty years since I first came to Primrose Hill. The applicant knew of the retail use of the ground floor when he bought the property and this is cynical application. which neither preserves nor enhances the CA.2. The design of the shopfront is one of a significant pair with 40 Chalcot Road. the joint design of both shops was defended in the 1980s when the owner of no. 40 was fined many thousand pounds for having changed the shopfront without consent. he even spent some nights in prison as he could not pay the fine. The view down Chalcot Road towards Primrose Hill park is framed by these two identical shopfronts. This is noted as a significant view in the pHCA Statement (p. 13) and these two shopfronts are an integral part of that view. It is a somewhat restrained statement to say that this is a strategic corner in the CA. Nothing should be done to alter this shopfront and the applicant must be stopped from carrying out this part of his application. Again this proposal neither preserves nor enhances the CA.3. the application for a the new basement single storey rear extension smacks of overdevelopment. Consent 2014/5503/P extended parts of the house with a mansard roof extension among others. There is only so much extending that a terraced Victorian house in a CA should have to bear. This removes part of the garden which is against the policies of both LBC and the PHCAAC. This should be resisted at all costs. Too much garden and green open space has been lost in the CA recently. The fact that other properties have extended into their gardens should in no way be taken as a precedent to permit this. Just because one bit of bad planning consent has occurred does not mean that this application can open up the door to another. recent should bear no weight regarding this part of the application. <p>For the above reasons I urge you to refuse this application.</p>
