

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0164/P	Nicholas Hytner	9 St Mark's Crescent London NW1 7TS	02/02/2017 17:47:50	COMMNT	I am the owner and occupier of 9, St Mark's Crescent and I have been alerted to the concerns of Sarah and Sandy Lieberson at 11, St Mark's Crescent. Their suggestion that there might be a limit to the depth of basement extensions on the canal side of the Crescent seems reasonable to me, and I appreciate their desire not to be overlooked. I note also the advice from the Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee. I hope the Liebersons' expectations as neighbours will be taken into account.
2017/0164/P	Dee Wright	22 St. Marks Crescent NW1 7TU NW1 7TU	02/02/2017 11:52:18	OBJ	Whilst building down has been a significant issue of objection on St Mark's Crescent, building out is of equal importance - especially on a side where back visibility is highly public and creates a view that plays a role in defining the character and 'beauty' of the area. When an extension reduces the garden significantly, destroying the balance of the elements it does not make sense to the building or to the inevitable effect it has on the immediate neighbours. Certainly when we had our extension across the road there were very strict planning regulations that prevented this - and for good reason. I believe these have not changed, and nor should they. In a conservation area the rules are strict are they not? If you open this up then the land grab will not stop at this. The front glazing is another thorny issue - no one else has been allowed to do this, and Planning have been very clear about this. Given they have it, I believe if it is touched then it should be made more subtle not less so. I think this is a very important application overall because the decision will affect the entire Crescent going forward, determining a whole range of future applications on that side of the street. The effect on number 11 is particularly severe as the extension dramatically oversteps its boundaries, robbing them of their rights to light and privacy. I think these have to be extremely important issues. Given the existing extension is probably the limit of what should be allowed for this property shouldn't any new work be limited to sympathetic renewal of that?