Young, Tony

From: Skelli-Yaoz, Tania
Sent: 22 December 2016 11:16
To: Planning
Subject: FW: 2016/6043/P

From: Pam White [mailto:[redacted]]
Sent: 22 December 2016 10:46
To: Skelli-Yaoz, Tania
Cc: Callaghan, Patricia (Councillor); Pietragnoli, Lazzaro (Councillor); Cotton, Richard (Councillor)
Subject: Re: 2016/6043/P

I wish to object to the latest plans for the buggy shed in front of the school caretaker's house on 2016/6043/P, as follows:

1. this new drawing is as unacceptable as the earlier one and the proposed building is obtrusive, inappropriate to the setting of a listed building and will be a visual intrusion on the streetscape. The design is clumsy and awkward, the roof is a very poor quality design, the space left behind the shed, between the shed and the wall, is an obvious space for rubbish to collect or for a small child to be lost in (despite the PHCAAC asking for the shed to be placed against this wall), the materials are inappropriate to the school keeper's house behind it, and altogether this shed will not preserve or enhance the CA. Rather it will be seen as something ruining this aspect of the frontage of the school in the CA.

2. the note says the shed is to be built in two parts so that one part can be removed if it is not needed. I asked the architect in early spring at our meeting at the school how many buggies could be kept in the shed and his answer was that he did not know. Apparently he still does not know which is deplorable.

3. Cllr Callaghan said in August that,
"The Primrose Hill School keepers house, is like the school, virtually unchanged since it was initially built. Now the above planning application has been submitted to add a' buggy shelter' which apart from being ugly will be a structure affixed to the front of this well preserved, authentic, house." She said we need, "a more valid, viable option than attaching a structure to the front of the house which will ruin the aesthetic view of the house, and will be pure vandalism. Please can we have a sensible discussion about the siting of this structure, and achieve the same result without ruining the frontage."

4. I request that you now ask the applicant to reconsider the plans for this buggy shed. The best result would be for no buggy shed to be built. This would save money and would not desecrate the front of this iconic building in the curtilage of a listed building. Buggies could be parked in the courtyard as required. This is a much simpler solution than this proposed poor quality design.

5. An alternative would be for a buggy parking area to provide rain and weather protection by using clear plastic sheeting fixed near the wall but moved back towards the caretaker's house, behind the return in the courtyard wall. A recent application here for a bike parking area in the playground used a clear plastic cover and something like this would not be obtrusive in this courtyard space.

In summary, I request that you refuse this application for the buggy shed or, at the very least, persuade the applicant to instal something visually much less intrusive as suggested above.

Pam White
45 Princess Road

London NW1 8JS
[redacted]

On 19 Dec 2016, at 15:42, Skelli-Yaoz, Tania <Tania.Skelli-Yaoz@camden.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Pam,

I will accept comments from everyone until I determine this application; which won't be before 5/1/2017.

Kind regards,

Tania Skelli-Yaoz
Senior Planning Officer (Mon-Thur)

Telephone: 020 7974 6829
-----Original Message-----
From: Pam White [mailto:[redacted]
Sent: 16 December 2016 17:02
To: Skelli-Yaoz, Tania
Subject: 2016/6043/P

As this is an approval of details, will you accept either or both:

comments from the CAAC

comments from local residents

and what is the closing date, given Christmas absences?

Pam White
Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee Telephone [redacted]