

From: Essential Vintage <info@essentialvintage.com>
Sent: 24 July 2015 23:42
To: Marfleet, Patrick
Subject: Planning Application 2015/3137/P

Planning Application 2015/3137/P

Flat 2
2 Albert Terrace
London
NW1 7SU

Objection from:

Mrs Susan Parkinson
Flat 7
2, Albert Terrace
London
NW1 7SU

Telephone 020 7722 3957

Dear Patrick

I have been asked by my neighbour Susan Parkinson to submit the following objection on her behalf as she does not have access to the internet.

Please do let me know if there is any problem with this comment being made by proxy.

" The proposed development is inappropriate within the conservation area and threatens the principle of protecting green spaces within a built up part of London. The plans, if approved would add to the damage being caused by destroying green spaces that are vital to keeping good practice environmentally and otherwise in this area.

Camden's own design guidelines that have just been adopted pledge to recognise and protect gardens in the Borough for the obvious benefits they deliver. This is stated in paragraphs 6.24 & 6.29 of CPG1.

The cumulative effects of applications such as the above are totally in conflict with the concept of keeping urban areas balanced between housing and the important other factors that compliment development.

The plans include two new additional windows to the rear of the property. These windows would look directly into the mews house opposite causing a real sense of intrusion to the occupants. This is unacceptable and could introduce a worrying scenario in the future if further applications to build above the proposed extension were granted. Numerous properties in the mews could then be blighted with overlooking issues diminishing amenity for all involved.

The proposed extensions on both sides of the central main part of the existing building are named by the applicant as "infills" suggesting that they are replacing structures that should rightfully be built in order to "complete" the property.

This is disingenous to say the least. The property was built in the mid 1840's and has never to date had any structures on the sites proposed.

Further to that, my understanding is that according to conservation area guidelines any such "infills" ought to be set back from the main building in an effort to respect the original architecture of the structure.

I am dismayed to see the illustrations contained within the proposed elevations of the application show an intention to clad the outer walls of the extension in slatted birch timber. This "faddish" finish is entirely at odds with this important Primrose Hill house that bears a blue plaque and is regarded as a destination property by many visitors to the area in light of it's historical importance. The building is rendered and painted as are all neighbouring properties.

The low quality visual appearance of the exterior of the proposed plans betrays an assumption that adding what is effectively a "lean-to" garden shed type extension to create an additional bedroom (and circa £350,000) to the property is a disappointing reminder of what steps property developers will stoop to in order to turn a fast profit at the expense of neighbouring properties, the conservation area and the environment.

I would urge that the council refuse this application".

Yours sincerely

**Mrs Susan Parkinson
Flat 7
2 Albert Terrace
London
NW1 7SU**

Kind regards

Phil Cowan

07973 114 396
020 7681 9212
@p_hillvintage