

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6521/P	Richard Simpson for Primrose Hill CAAC	Primrose Hill CAAC 12A Manley Street NW1 8LT NW1 8LT	08/02/2018 17:36:24	OBJ	ADVICE from Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee 12A Manley Street, London NW1 8LT  7 February 2018

Flat A 21 Princess Road NW1 8JR 2017/6521/P

Strong objection.

We note that we objected to the 2016 application (2016/5349/P) on grounds that included the advice that 'The proposed back addition is built out beyond the established rear line of the terrace and further diminishes the openness of the rear area, already compromised.'

The present application seeks the retrospective approval of the construction of a building which is not only deeper, but also higher. We note that the present application now breaks the general pattern of heights as well as depth. This is in basic contradiction of Primrose Hill conservation area Statement policy guidance at PH27 which states that extensions should be 'in harmony with the original form and character of the house ...'. While we accept that the quality of design to the rear of this house is cumulatively poor, nonetheless, it is the purpose of designation that the character and appearance of the conservation area should be preserved or enhanced. This proposal does neither: it is seriously harmful to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

We also object strongly on the grounds of harm to the amenity of neighbours. The proposal to convert the roof to a terrace would enable direct overlooking of the neighbours' space and habitable rooms from a raised platform in close proximity to the adjoining property.

We request that the application is refused and enforcement action taken.

Richard Simpson FSA  
Chair

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6521/P	David Holmes	5 Calvert St London NW1 8NE	07/02/2018 13:17:57	AMEND	<p>Dear Sir or Madam:</p> <p>I am writing to you regarding Planning Application number 2017/6521/P. My property's address is 5 Calvert St, adjacent to the above but accessed from the rear. I also own the freehold of 23/23A Princess Road.</p> <p>I have already submitted strong objections whilst the work was ongoing under application 2016/5349/P at 21 Princess Road. I alerted the Council to a breach of the approved plans and I received an acknowledgement of my concerns. Bewilderingly I have had no further reply or comment from yourselves during the unapproved building work.</p> <p>Whilst the work was ongoing, I was alerted to a clear and planned overbuild to the approved plans and we were told by the agents that they would be applying for retrospective planning permission for this work. This points to a premeditated overbuild which is completely unacceptable.</p> <p>I note that the recent planning application is for "Retention of existing rear extension and installation of metal railings to use roof extension as terrace, replacement of existing balustrade with railings..." I would like to stress that they have downplayed the objectionable and unsympathetic increase in the height of the rear elevation.</p> <p>My overriding concern is the deliberate overbuild of 330mm to the height of the rear elevations as shown in their plans which they have submitted under 2017/6521/P. I also note from their Design and Access Statement, Paragraph 6 Conclusions, that they intend to increase the height over and above 330mm by the addition of concrete coping stones.</p> <p>This has several effects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There was no indication whatsoever on the original approved plans (2016/5349/P) that there was to be a roof terrace built adjacent and overlooking my property.</li> <li>2. The overbuild of 330mm breaks the line of the rear elevations, which is entirely unacceptable from an aesthetic point of view and detracts from the eye appeal of the Primrose Hill Conservation Area.</li> <li>3. The overbuild further reduces light into my property at 5 Calvert Street as my office relies on tangential light from the rear aspect.</li> <li>4. The contractors have installed non-functioning guttering between my property and their new build. There has been no party wall agreement and as a result water will run off between the two properties and will more than likely result in water damage to my property.</li> </ol> <p>The applicant and agent have cited that the overbuild was "a clerical error". Comparing the plans submitted under 2017/6521/P and 2016/5349/P shows that this is not the case and was clearly planned from the early stages.</p> <p>I respectfully request this Planning Application is refused.</p>

**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Consultees Addr:**    **Received:**    **Comment:**    **Response:**

Sincerely

David Holmes

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6521/P	Pietro Lambert	23A princess road Nw18jr	07/02/2018 19:27:18	COMMNT	<p>Dear Sir or Madam:</p> <p>I am writing to you regarding Planning Application number 2017/6521/P. My property's address is 23A Princess road, adjacent to 21 and 21 Flat A.</p> <p>There is no party wall agreement for the wall and railings and the gutters are now in direct contact with my property!</p> <p>I have already submitted strong objections whilst the work was ongoing under application 2016/5349/P at 21 Princess Road. I alerted the Council to a breach of the approved plans and I received an acknowledgement of my concerns. Bewilderingly I have had no further reply or comment from yourselves during the unapproved building work despite receiving an email stating we were to receive a feedback within 5 business days.</p> <p>Whilst the work was ongoing, I was alerted to a clear and planned overbuild to the approved plans and we were told by the agent that they would be applying for retrospective planning permission for this work. This is points to a premeditated overbuild which is completely unacceptable.</p> <p>I note that the recent planning application is for "Retention of existing rear extension and installation of metal railings to use roof extension as terrace, replacement of existing balustrade with railings..." I would like to stress that they have downplayed the objectionable and unsympathetic increase in the height of the rear elevation.</p> <p>My overriding concern is the deliberate overbuild of 40 cm to the height of the rear elevations as shown in their plans which they have submitted under 2017/6521/P. This has several effects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There was no indication whatsoever on the original approved plans (2016/5349/P) that there was to be a roof terrace built adjacent and overlooking my property.</li> <li>2. The overbuild of 40 cm breaks the line of the rear elevations, which is entirely unacceptable from an aesthetic point of view.</li> <li>3. The overbuild further reduces light into my property at 23A princess road as my terrace is adjacent to the wall and railings. I feel i m boxed.</li> <li>4. I have 2 your children age 3 (twens) and i this new terrace create privacy concerns for my family.</li> <li>5. The contractors have installed non-functioning guttering between my property and their new build. There has been NO PARTY WALL agreement and as a result water will run off between the two properties and will more than likely result in water damage to my property.</li> </ol> <p>The applicant and agent have cited that the overbuild was "a clerical error". Comparing the plans submitted under 2017/6521/P and 2016/5349/P shows that this is not the case and was clearly planned from the early stages.</p>

**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Consultees Addr:**    **Received:**    **Comment:**    **Response:**

I respectfully request this Planning Application is refused.

Sincerely

Pietro Lambert

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6521/P	David Holmes	5 Calvert St Primrose Hill London NW1 8NE	06/02/2018 17:25:45	OBJ	<p>Dear Sir or Madam:</p> <p>I am writing to you regarding Planning Application number 2017/6521/P. My property's address is 5 Calvert St, adjacent to the above but accessed from the rear. I also own the freehold of 23/23A Princess Road.</p> <p>I have already submitted strong objections whilst the work was ongoing under application 2016/5349/P at 21 Princess Road. I alerted the Council to a breach of the approved plans and I received an acknowledgement of my concerns. Confusingly, I have had no further reply or comment from yourselves during the unapproved building work.</p> <p>Whilst the work was ongoing, I was alerted to a clear and planned overbuild to the approved plans and I was told by the agent that they would be applying for retrospective planning permission for this work. This is points to a premeditated overbuild which is completely unacceptable.</p> <p>I note that the recent planning application is for "Retention of existing rear extension and installation of metal railings to use roof extension as terrace, replacement of existing balustrade with railings..." I would like to stress that they have downplayed the objectionable and unsympathetic increase in the height of the rear elevation.</p> <p>My overriding concern is the deliberate overbuild of 330mm to the height of the rear elevations as shown in their plans which they have submitted under 2017/6521/P. This has several effects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There was no indication whatsoever on the original approved plans (2016/5349/P) that there was to be a roof terrace built adjacent and overlooking my property.</li> <li>2. The overbuild of 330mm breaks the line of the rear elevations, which is entirely unacceptable from an aesthetic point of view.</li> <li>3. The overbuild further reduces light into my property at 5 Calvert Street as my office relies on tangential light from the rear aspect.</li> <li>4. The contractors have installed non-functioning guttering between my property and their new build. There has been no party wall agreement and as a result water will run off between the two properties and will more than likely result in water damage to my property.</li> </ol> <p>The applicant and agent have cited that the overbuild was "a clerical error". Comparing the plans submitted under 2017/6521/P and 2016/5349/P shows that this is not the case and was clearly planned from the early stages and their early intention was to apply for retrospective planning permission.</p> <p>I respectfully request this Planning Application is refused.</p> <p>Sincerely</p> <p>David Holmes</p>

**Application No:**   **Consultees Name:**   **Consultees Addr:**   **Received:**   **Comment:**   **Response:**

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6521/P	Pietro Lambert	23A Princess Road	07/02/2018 19:02:35	INT	<p>Dear Sir or Madam:</p> <p>I am writing to you regarding Planning Application number 2017/6521/P. My property's address is 23A Princess Road, adjacent to 21 and 21 Flat A.</p> <p>There is no party wall agreement for the wall and railings and the gutters are now in direct contact with my property!</p> <p>I have already submitted strong objections whilst the work was ongoing under application 2016/5349/P at 21 Princess Road. I alerted the Council to a breach of the approved plans and I received an acknowledgement of my concerns. Bewilderingly I have had no further reply or comment from yourselves during the unapproved building work despite receiving an email stating we were to receive a feedback within 5 business days.</p> <p>Whilst the work was ongoing, I was alerted to a clear and planned overbuild to the approved plans and we were told by the agent that they would be applying for retrospective planning permission for this work. This is points to a premeditated overbuild which is completely unacceptable.</p> <p>I note that the recent planning application is for "Retention of existing rear extension and installation of metal railings to use roof extension as terrace, replacement of existing balustrade with railings..." I would like to stress that they have downplayed the objectionable and unsympathetic increase in the height of the rear elevation.</p> <p>My overriding concern is the deliberate overbuild of 40 cm to the height of the rear elevations as shown in their plans which they have submitted under 2017/6521/P. This has several effects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There was no indication whatsoever on the original approved plans (2016/5349/P) that there was to be a roof terrace built adjacent and overlooking my property.</li> <li>2. The overbuild of 40 cm breaks the line of the rear elevations, which is entirely unacceptable from an aesthetic point of view.</li> <li>3. The overbuild further reduces light into my property at 23A Princess Road as my terrace is adjacent to the wall and railings. I feel I am boxed.</li> <li>4. I have 2 children age 3 (twins) and this new terrace create privacy concerns for my family.</li> <li>5. The contractors have installed non-functioning guttering between my property and their new build. There has been NO PARTY WALL agreement and as a result water will run off between the two properties and will more than likely result in water damage to my property.</li> </ol> <p>The applicant and agent have cited that the overbuild was "a clerical error". Comparing the plans submitted under 2017/6521/P and 2016/5349/P shows that this is not the case and was clearly planned from the early stages.</p>



**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Consultees Addr:**    **Received:**    **Comment:**    **Response:**

I respectfully request this Planning Application is refused.

Sincerely

Pietro Lambert

---