

**From:** Essential Vintage <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** 31 August 2015 21:02  
**To:** Marfleet, Patrick  
**Subject:** Planning Application 2015/3137/P

**Importance:** High

**Planning Application 2015/3137/P**  
**Flat 2**  
**2 Albert Terrace**  
**London**  
**NW1 7SU**

Dear Patrick

I understand the above application has been recommended for approval and is due to be decided at Members Briefing on Tuesday 1st September.

**There are some points I would like to raise regarding the Officer Report:**

1. The report shows a series of photographs of the site that are very misleading. They suggest that the area where the proposed extension is to be built is basically a brownfield site, quite the opposite of what it used to be - a thriving, beautiful garden that has now been deliberately destroyed.

The previous occupants of the property had spent 11 years evolving a useful and environmentally beneficial urban green space that was levelled after their departure and has resulted in reduced amenity for neighbouring properties and the conservation area as a whole.

The report ( 2.3.4 ) states that a loss of 13 square metres of the garden is acceptable and would still leave 50 square metres of outside space.

These figures are incorrect according to calculations based on the size of the extension contained in the plans which would in fact result in the loss of a significantly larger area of land.

This loss would indeed detract from the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

2. The report ( 2.3.3 ) refers to concerns raised by objections relating to potential loss of privacy for properties in Albert Terrace Mews.

The conclusion that the proposed 2 new windows on the rear elevation of the property would not affect amenity for neighbouring properties is flawed.

This conclusion fails to take into account that the existing window currently looks into a blank wall on the rear of the mews house.

The proposed new windows would be looking directly into windows of the house at 2 Albert Terrace Mews at very close proximity and would most definitely cause a significant erosion of privacy for its' occupants.

3. The report states in the officer's responses to Consultation ( 5 ):

" The proposed extension is considered to be acceptable in terms of its size and design and would appear as a subordinate addition when set against the rear elevation of the host dwelling, the original form of which has already been lost due to the existing 3 storey rear extension at the site "

It is my understanding that new guidelines deem the concept of 'precedent' to be irrelevant, therefore to refer to a previous alteration as being material to this application is redundant.

**In addition to my previous objection to the above application I would like to add the following points:**

1. The applicant has claimed that the extension will not be visible from the street at Albert Terrace. This is not factual. From the pavement at the boundaries between no's 2 and 3 there is a clear view down into the back garden where the proposed extension is planned.

This street view of the proposed addition is unacceptable in the conservation area.

2. The applicant has revised the plans on 3 separate occasions which has left a sense of confusion amongst affected parties, some of whom had thought they had commented on the final proposals when in fact they were unaware of changes to the plans. This situation has occurred in spite of requests for updates from those who have objected, which have not materialised.

3. Finally, I am perplexed that this application which appears to contravene many of the guidelines contained within the Camden Plan has been recommended for approval and if it is agreed at the Members Briefing, will adversely affect a large number of people as well as being detrimental to the environment and the Primrose Hill Conservation Area.

For the reasons above and those in my previous objection I would ask that this application be refused.

Kind regards

Phil Cowan

Flat One  
2 Albert Terrace  
London  
NW1 7SU

