

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/0822/P	John Cottrell	Flat 3 56 Regents Park Road London NW1 7SX	26/03/2016 17:51:22	SUPPEMAI L	Photograph P(03)02 shows that the rear elevations of numbers 58, 62 and 64 Regents Park Road have been rendered. These houses are of a different design from the terrace of semi-detached houses that runs from numbers 38 to 56. None of the rear elevations of the semi-detached houses have been rendered apart from small areas, mostly sections of infill between the original houses. The brickwork of the rear elevation of number 54 is original and in excellent condition, so it would seem that the proposal to render it would directly conflict with conservation area guideline PH12 "Original brickwork should not be painted, rendered or clad unless this was the original treatment"
2016/0822/P	Elizabeth Middleton	Basement Flat 52 Regents Park Rd London NW1 7SX	24/03/2016 11:03:17	WREP	<p>My understanding is that the proposed changes in the current application (excluding the rendering) were refused in previous applications.</p> <p>In relation to the glass balustrades i would make two comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. whilst i don't have a strong objection on the grounds of appearance they will certainly not unify the house with 52. 52 has metal balustrades and these were a requirement of planning permission for the recent ground floor extension and new balcony at first floor level.</li> <li>2. In previous drawings the balustrades were shown on the inside of the planting required to be maintained in perpetuity at the first floor balcony level to provide privacy for the basement flat garden at 52. I can't see how practically the planting and maintenance of window boxes can be carried out with a glass screen in front of the boxes. Access would only be from a ladder from the passage way. I would have no objection if the balustrade (whether or not permission is granted for glass) was on the outside of the plant boxes.</li> </ol> <p>With regard to the proposed extension of the stairwell. I remember that this was the subject of a very strong objection by the CAAC on the ground grounds that the existing stairwell was an architectural feature of the building. The planning department seems, on this development, to have largely ignored the strong objections of the CAAC which surprised me as my understanding was that it had a statutory duty to take the committee's view into account. I am concerned that the whole conservation area becomes ultimately at risk if the CAAC's considered views are simply ignored. What may seem insignificant in one development unfortunately sets a precedent elsewhere and so the creeping process of ever more modern development occurs. I can think of many examples of this in the 30 years i have lived in Primrose Hill.</p>
2016/0822/P	Celia Hoyles	52 Regents Park Road	24/03/2016 19:17:48	COMMNT	<p>as far as I understand it the request for glass balustrades at all consistent with neighbouring properties. (our own application for a small balcony had to have black metal railings - and of course severe limit on length to fit in with No 50</p> <p>As for the extension of the stair rotunda to the upper floor it was argued before as architectural inappropriate and still is....</p>