

From: Essential Vintage [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 July 2015 15:11
To: Marfleet, Patrick
Subject: Planning Application 2015/3137/P

Application 2015/3137/P

Flat 2
2 Albert Terrace
London NW1 7SU

Objection

Dear Patrick

I would like to submit a strong objection to the above application for the following reasons:

1. This application would involve a further erosion of open space in a garden that is already comparatively small in relation to the size of the property at 2 Albert Terrace. The existing garden is an important part of the property as it, along with other rear gardens in the area, contribute to improving the environment for wildlife, air quality and a sense of proportion and openness in an inner London "village".

Developments of this type create a sense of encroachment and overcrowding that is detrimental to the amenity of the conservation area.

Indeed Camden's own Design Guidance CPG1 seeks to recognise and protect rear gardens with a view to improving amenity, biodiversity and character (paragraphs 6.24 and 6.29).

I think that loss of green spaces such as this, purely for the purposes of capitalising on high property prices is unacceptable and should be strongly resisted.

2. The application contains within its design statement a desire to infill a "missing block" at the rear of the building with a single story extension.

This is a very misleading comment as no structure has existed in the area referred to since the house was built in 1841. Therefore to maintain that the proposals are intended to somehow complete a building that is "missing" a component is highly questionable.

Further to this point, the infills proposed on either side of the central mass of the rear of 2 Albert Terrace are in conflict with conservation area guidelines that require that additions of this type be set back from the main building in order to respect the undulating profile of the original design.

3. The plans involve the creation of two new glazed areas facing out to the properties in Albert Terrace Mews.

The new glazed door and window will create overlooking issues for the residents in the property directly behind 2 Albert Terrace. The main house and the mews house are in close proximity that I believe to be well under 18 meters.

The rooms that would be affected by this intrusion are deemed to be "habitable".

4. The finishes on the proposed extensions are vastly out of keeping with those of the main building which is a distinctive, historical "blue plaque" house of special interest in Primrose Hill.

The use of slatted hardwood exterior walls is highly inappropriate within a conservation area and such "fashion" design features will not stand the test of time.

5. This example of overdevelopment is driven by one factor only-profit. The special nature of conservation areas such as Primrose Hill has been achieved by careful stewardship and considered planning decisions.

This application is a speculative attempt to cash in on property prices at the expense of the conservation area, neighbouring properties and the environment.

For the reasons stated above I would urge that this application be refused.

Yours sincerely

Phil Cowan

Flat One
2 Albert Terrace
London
NW1 7SU

