[redacted]

From: John | JPB Architects [redacted]
Sent: 22 December 2017 14:17
To: Planning
Subject: FW: Comments on 2017/4680/P have been received by the council.

Dear Planning,

Please refer to email trail below.

Regards

John Broderick RIBA
jpb architects

Cedar House
Vine Lane
Hillingdon
UB10 0NF

[redacted]

From: John | JPB Architects
Sent: 22 December 2017 14:15
To: 'Constantinescu, Nora-Andreea' [redacted]
Subject: FW: Comments on 2017/4680/P have been received by the council.

Afternoon Nora,

Further to my email below, I have now received our clients comments and summarise as follows:

"The revised plans are little different from our perspective compared with their original plans.
What they have done is made an attempt to 'anchor' our expectations. We end up comparing the new plans with the original plans, not with the status quo ex ante. But we really should do the latter, not the former.

The first issue is height. The development goes all the way up to the second floor. That's a whole storey higher than the neighbours, I think. The second, related, issue is daylight. Our garden ends up being surrounded by even more high brick wall than is the case already. The third issue is that the overall reduction in floor space of the new plan is largely an issue of width, not depth, which might be good news for the immediate neighbours but makes little difference to us.

Your own suggestions (To reduce the first floor and remove the balcony to the second floor) make more sense than theirs but I still think they're an example of "overdevelopment" which, indeed, the architects admitted in their original submission. Put another way, had we never had sight of the original submission, we would have as strenuously objected to the latest version."

Please keep me updated on the status of the application.

I also take this opportunity to Extend Seasons Greetings to you and Best Wishes for 2018.

Regards

John Broderick RIBA
jpb architects

Cedar House
Vine Lane
Hillingdon
UB10 0NF

[redacted]

From: John | JPB Architects
Sent: 18 December 2017 10:55
To: 'Constantinescu, Nora-Andreea' [redacted]
Subject: FW: Comments on 2017/4680/P have been received by the council.

Good Morning Nora,

Pinal is currently on leave, I am awaiting our clients response to the current proposals. I have suggested additional amendments to him including a reduction to the proposed first flor to that of the adjoining property at number 34, in addition the terrace should be removed from the second floor.

I will confirm our clients response as soon as I receive.

Regards

John Broderick RIBA
jpb architects

Cedar House
Vine Lane
Hillingdon
UB10 0NF

[redacted]

From: Pinal | JPB Architects
Sent: 15 December 2017 09:23
To: Constantinescu, Nora-Andreea [redacted]
Cc: John | JPB Architects [redacted]
Subject: RE: Comments on 2017/4680/P have been received by the council.

Dear Nora,

Thank you for your email.

We have issued revised plans to our client for consideration.

Kind Regards,

Ms Pinal Patel
JPB Architects I Cedar house I Vine Lane I Hillingdon I Uxbridge I UB10 0NF I [redacted]

From: Constantinescu, Nora-Andreea [redacted]
Sent: 14 December 2017 18:04
To: Pinal | JPB Architects
Subject: RE: Comments on 2017/4680/P have been received by the council.

Dear Pinal,

Please have a look online to the revised scheme and let me know if your client would still want to consider objecting.

Best Regards,

Nora-Andreea Constantinescu
Planning Officer - Development Management

[redacted]

From: Pinal | JPB Architects [mailto:[redacted]
Sent: 06 December 2017 14:59
To: Constantinescu, Nora-Andreea [redacted]
Subject: FW: Comments on 2017/4680/P have been received by the council.

Dear Nora,

Thank you for your time and update us regarding above application.
Please see below trail an email sent on general planning email address.
We appreciate if you could take into account prior to decision.

Also we would appreciate if you could let us know progress of the application.

Kind Regards,

Ms Pinal Patel
JPB Architects I Cedar house I Vine Lane I Hillingdon I Uxbridge I UB10 0NF I [redacted]

From: STEPHEN KING [mailto:[redacted]
Sent: 03 November 2017 15:02
To: John | JPB Architects [redacted]
Cc: aaYvonne [redacted]
Subject: Fwd: Comments on 2017/4680/P have been received by the council.

Hi John

Thanks for phoning earlier. Here is the objection I sent to Camden earlier today.

If you have additional thoughts, please let us know!

Stephen

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: <planning@camden.gov..uk>
Date: 3 November 2017 at 12:47:55 GMT
To: [redacted]
Subject: Comments on 2017/4680/P have been received by the council..

1. We object to the proposed development at 34a Rosslyn Hill: it is inconsistent with current guidelines both in terms of height and scale and encroaches excessively on near neighbours. The planning application, meanwhile, is highly misleading.
2. The photograph below paragraph 3 on page 1 of the Design and Access Statement shows not only a view of the rear of 28-36 Rosslyn Hill but also the side elevation of 2A Pilgrim's Lane. It is clear that the two windows at the top of that side elevation would offer a direct view of the proposed extension. Yet the application only takes into account the effect of the development on numbers 32 and 36 Rosslyn Hill.
3. The claims in paragraph 9 of the document are misleading. Although the height of the proposed extension to 34a Rosslyn Hill is similar to 32 Rosslyn Hill, the surface area involved is far greater. Specifically, whereas the 32 Rosslyn Hill proposal envisioned an increase in floor space of 26m2 (see http://camdocs.camden.gov.uk/HPRMWebDrawer/Record/5390424/file/document?inline), the 34a proposal amounts to 80m2. It is inappropriate, therefore, to suggest that there is any precedent for the 34a plan.
4. The Site Location Plan also suggests that the proposed development will overlook the garden of 2A Pilgrim's Lane and the rear windows of 2B Pilgrim's Lane, encroaching on what is already a limited supply of natural light.
5. Paragraph 12 usefully summarises the current guidance but paragraph 13 then makes a claim that simply cannot be substantiated [12. It is noted that Policies DP24 and CPG1 (design) advocate a general presumption towards resisting extensions that rise above the general height of neighbouring projections and nearby extensions. 13. The proposal however, represents an opportunity to improve the appearance of part of the rear façade of the "terrace" which would have a beneficial effect on this part of the Hampstead CA]. Because the planning proposal makes reference only to the impact of the extension on 32 and 36 Rosslyn Hill, it ignores the impact on other neighbours, including those at 2A and 2B Pilgrim's Lane.
6. We disagree, therefore, with the statements made in paragraph 14 [It is considered the proposal would not materially harm the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties in terms of a loss of sunlight/daylight or outlook than the existing arrangements]. The proposals make no mention of the impact on 2A and 2B Pilgrim's Lane.
7. Paragraph 17 is factually incorrect [our proposal would be of a similar scale, design and facing materials to [the 32 Rosslyn Hill] approved addition"]: the scale of development at 34 Rosslyn Hill would be considerably greater than at 32 given the larger surface area of the ground floor building (see point 2 above).
8. The proposed balconies at the rear of both the first floor and second floor extensions suggest that noise could be a problem for surrounding neighbours. These balconies are out of keeping with the existing buildings and it is not obvious why offices would need such balconies. The balconies would overlook 2B Pilgrim's Lane (see Sight Location Plan).
9. No allowance has been made for the various air conditioning and extractor fans which currently serve the restaurant on the ground floor of 34 Rosslyn Hill. A comparison between the existing and proposed AA and rear elevation drawings suggests that these have somehow 'disappeared'..

Comments made by Stephen King of 2A Pilgrim's Lane
Phone 07595530076
EMail [redacted]
Preferred Method of Contact is Email

Comment Type is Objection

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e-mail is intended for the addressee only... If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e- mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer.

Disclaimer

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived by **Mimecast Ltd**, an innovator in Software as a Service (SaaS) for business. Providing a **safer** and **more useful** place for your human generated data. Specializing in; Security, archiving and compliance. To find out more Click Here.