Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:
Application No: 2017/0351/P	Robert Ulph	Flat 4 66 Gloucester Avenue London NW1 8JD	06/03/2017 13:10:31	

Response:

I am the owner of Flat 4, 66 Gloucester Avenue, adjacent to Flat 3, one of the flats the subject of this planning application. My flat shares the same front door from the street and is to the left as seen from the street.

Printed on:

13/03/2017

09:05:07

I wish to object to the proposal contained in the application to install a roof terrace at the rear at ground floor level. At its closest this would be just two metres from my kitchen and four metres from my living room. I understand that the proposal is to offer some privacy by means of installation of railings and some potted plants. My objections are the following:

- 1. In spite of the proposals, the roof terrace will substantially affect my privacy. There will be a direct line of sight from very close into my kitchen and a more oblique line of sight into my living room. There is nothing to ensure that the plants would provide adequate privacy or indeed would be retained. Several years ago the applicant and his partner extended Flat 1 to the rear. The planning consent required that a sedum roof be installed on this extension. This was done, but it does not seem to have been maintained at all so far as I am aware. The sedum is now brown (I think it is dead) and the only living plant seems to be a large thistle. While access to a roof terrace would clearly be easier, so the plants easier to maintain, I'm afraid I still don't have much confidence that they would actually be maintained well enough to secure my privacy.
- 2. Even with a privacy screen there will be a lot of noise coming into my flat when people use the terrace. I would imagine that it would be likely to be used late at night in summer. While the present owners are a young family and reasonably quiet, future owners might not be.
- 3. Generally I will feel that I am being boxed in if the roof terrace is built. The area at the rear of my flat is a relatively open expanse and I find it of value. Birds use it to fly along and they also nest in the ivy in the rear wall. I have always found this rather pleasant. Birds will clearly be less able to fly along the rear, and less likely to nest there if they are liable to be disturbed by people on a nearby roof terrace at the same height as their nests.

Additionally, the only notice which seems to have been given of this planning application is a yellow notice affixed to a lamppost outside the flats. It is sitting on the ground, and is easy to miss because parked cars can obscure it. I am concerned that other residents of the building may not be aware of this planning application (I only became aware of it on 4th March). If you have not heard from other residents, please do not assume that they have no objections.

Finally I am a little puzzled by the differences in the architects' drawings for the common areas in the existing and proposed ground floor. I understand that the entrance for Flat 1 is to be moved, along with the pigeonholes. But the proposal for the ground floor shows a window instead of a door for the street level, removal of an item across the hallway (I don't know what this is), and no longer shows my front door as a door. I am sure these are all mistakes, but it would be helpful if the architects could confirm that nothing is intended by them.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Printed on: 13/03/2017 09:05:07 Response:
2017/0351/P	Caroline Jarrold	The Normans Run Lane Rockland St Mary Norfolk NR14 7EZ	08/03/2017 21:11:52	COMNOT	I am the owner of Flat 2, 66 Gloucester Avenue, London, NW1 8JD. This is the neighbouring basement flat to Flat 1 where the proposed development would take place. I am concerned about the proposal to construct a roof terrace. The proposed terrace would directly overlook the garden to my flat. Although the plans show a privacy screen of some sort, no details are given of what the screen would be or how it would be maintained. It looks as though it may just be planted with a mesh support or railings but unless this was well-maintained it would be an eyesore and provide little privacy.
					I am also concerned that no regard has been taken of the loss of natural light to my property associated with this proposal. Both of these points are also noted in the email from Richard Simpson FSA in the submission and in the comments from the planners which do not seem to have been taken into account.
					Apart from this aspect, I am supportive of the planned developments subject to the detailed requirements of Golamead Ltd the ultimate Landlord.
					I only became aware of these plans on 4 March as one of the other flat owners alerted me to them. My flat is currently rented out.
2017/0351/P	Richard Simpson for Primrose Hill CAAC	12A Manley Street NW1 8LT NW1 8LT	02/03/2017 13:35:11	OBJ	ADVICE from Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee 12A Manley Street, London NW1 8LT
	CAAC	NWI OLI			15 February 2017
					Flats 1 & 3 66-68 Gloucester Avenue NW1 8JD 2017/0351/P
					We always regret the loss of smaller residential units in the CA, but acknowledge that policy allows the loss of one unit in a property.
					We would normally object to the provision of an infill extension at the rear above lower ground floor, but in this circumstance, where the rear looks on to a high wall, we do not object.
					We object to the planted privacy screen, which we do not see as effective in either height or materials: it needs to provide real screening for the neighbours without loss of natural light in this tightly enclosed area.
					Richard Simpson FSA Chair