

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3137/P	Lorna Bradbury	2 Albert Terrace Mews London NW1 7TA	05/08/2015 15:31:19	OBJ	<p>We strongly object to this planning application, which clearly contravenes several of Camden's own planning guidelines. Given that Camden has allowed several gardens in Albert Terrace Mews to be concreted over in recent years, we fear your own environmental rules will again be ignored and concerns about further loss of garden space will be put aside.</p> <p>The greater concern for us, and for others in ATM, is the shocking loss of privacy which would result from the creation of new windows which will open out intrusively onto our three children's bedroom windows at the back of our house. It is very clear why, when that extension was built many years ago, consent was not granted for windows to be opened up. It was because windows would have destroyed the privacy of those in the mews, and nothing has changed in the decades since. Moreover, should this application be granted, it will create a precedent that will allow windows to be built higher up the structure. I am advised, though I have not been able to measure it myself, that the distance between our house and the new in-filled extension would be less than 18 metres.</p> <p>The size of the proposed extension is far too big for the site and the existing size of the garden, and substantially changes the profile of the building.</p> <p>Finally, the hardwood slatted finish is so ugly, architecturally illiterate, and out of keeping with 1840s Primrose Hill houses that I can only assume it has been included as a way of giving the committee an opportunity to look tough by rejecting one aspect while approving the rest of the application. Such an intolerable eyesore cannot surely be contemplated seriously by a planning committee responsible for a conservation area.</p> <p>We ask that the committee reject this application in its entirety.</p>
2015/3137/P	Leonard & Pamela Marks	1 Albert Terrace Mews, London NW1 7TA	05/08/2015 15:21:52	COMMNT	<p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>We live at 1, Albert Terrace Mews. This proposed development is obliquely behind us. The proposed wooden finish is completely out of character to the beautiful 1840 houses. The garden will be eroded & we will lose yet another of our green spaces.</p> <p>The house next door, 1 Albert Terrace, has built a large, very ugly, green air-raid shelter behind the house & destroyed the garden. Now another garden will disappear. We believed Camden Council encouraged green spaces & would implore someone to come & inspect the site from behind to get some idea of what this would mean.</p> <p>Also the idea of putting large windows on the rear wall would completely destroy the privacy for the Mews houses behind.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3137/P	Lorna Bradbury	2 Albert Terrace Mews London NW1 7TA	05/08/2015 15:30:57	OBJ	<p>We strongly object to this planning application, which clearly contravenes several of Camden's own planning guidelines. Given that Camden has allowed several gardens in Albert Terrace Mews to be concreted over in recent years, we fear your own environmental rules will again be ignored and concerns about further loss of garden space will be put aside.</p> <p>The greater concern for us, and for others in ATM, is the shocking loss of privacy which would result from the creation of new windows which will open out intrusively onto our three children's bedroom windows at the back of our house. It is very clear why, when that extension was built many years ago, consent was not granted for windows to be opened up. It was because windows would have destroyed the privacy of those in the mews, and nothing has changed in the decades since. Moreover, should this application be granted, it will create a precedent that will allow windows to be built higher up the structure. I am advised, though I have not been able to measure it myself, that the distance between our house and the new in-filled extension would be less than 18 metres.</p> <p>The size of the proposed extension is far too big for the site and the existing size of the garden, and substantially changes the profile of the building.</p> <p>Finally, the hardwood slatted finish is so ugly, architecturally illiterate, and out of keeping with 1840s Primrose Hill houses that I can only assume it has been included as a way of giving the committee an opportunity to look tough by rejecting one aspect while approving the rest of the application. Such an intolerable eyesore cannot surely be contemplated seriously by a planning committee responsible for a conservation area.</p> <p>We ask that the committee reject this application in its entirety.</p>
