

[REDACTED]

From: Quigley, Elaine
Sent: 31 July 2015 13:27
To: Planning
Subject: FW: 142 Arlington Road NW1, 2015/3103/P. CTCAAC added comment.

Hi, Can this be logged as an objection to one of my AOD applications (details above). **Can Gordon's personal email details be redacted.**

Thanks

Elaine

Elaine Quigley
Senior Planning Officer

Telephone: 020 7974 5101

From: Gordon Macquere [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 July 2015 13:27 [REDACTED]
To: Quigley, Elaine
Cc: Margaret Richardson
Subject: 142 Arlington Road NW1, 2015/3103/P. CTCAAC added comment.

Dear Elaine,

Today is the 31st and the last day for comments. We are sorry this clarification of our 27th July email could not be sent in sooner but it is a little clearer than our email of the 27th.

To clarify, our comments are:

A: We object to the revised elevations which show radically revised roof extension window positions, window shapes and sizes because,

1. surely these revisions to the drawings allowed on Appeal require a new planning application? They make a material difference to the building's appearance as allowed on Appeal and surely should be re-consulted publicly with a new application.
2. unlike the elevation drawings allowed on Appeal the roof extension's window openings (and fenestrations) no longer relate positively to the storeys below in terms of position and shared symmetry.
3. unlike the elevation drawings allowed on Appeal the roof extension's corners are no longer glazed. Solid corners on the extension would look lumpen and unconsidered by comparison with the carefully considered design in elevations on other storey levels.
4. the loss of the architectural 'lightness' of the glazed corners negatively affects the character of the proposal and does not preserve the character of the CA, particularly as these corners are in an eye-catching position for the public in Arlington Road and Parkway.
5. Would the Appeal Inspector's view of the design been different had this revised roof extension been part of the proposal?

B: Apart from the roof extension as A above we do not object to the 'joinery' and 'joinery'-to-opening details.

Again, we should like to be told whether the Council is going to re-consult/ advertise locally on this significantly revised scheme or not.

Yours sincerely

Margaret Richardson & Gordon Macqueen, Co-Chairs Camden Town CAAC