Printed on: 30/05/2018 09:10:06

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:
2018/1486/P	iavne Mitchell	20/05/2018 16:32:35	OBJ

Response:

We are saddened to see yet another application for this important corner site. This application needs to be reviewed in the historical context of previous applications; the first was 2014/4058/P, which was allowed only on appeal, and 2017/5170/P which has been refused with a warning of enforcement action.

Rather than revert to the original approved application, following the decision on 2017/5170/P, the Applicant is instead using this third application to seek 'after the fact' permission for the significant divergence from the original approved plans. The building which has now been built, and for which permission is now being sought, does nothing to improve the streetscape. In fact, this whole development is a massive demonstration of a lost opportunity for improvement. The finished building looks 'butchered' and 'wrong', and needs to be corrected with utmost speed and efficiency.

We have objected to both previous applications, and have been supported in our views by the Planners at Camden Council. Whilst still not enamoured of the original application, it is what it is and we could learn to live with it. However, this blatant disrespect for the planning process and the resultant building cannot be ignored. It is not acceptable for this Applicant to finish building and then apply for permission, with fantasy post-rationalisations for their significant deviation from the approved plans. We would strongly recommend to the Planners, once again, that this application is refused, and this time with a Notice of Enforcement action rather than just a warning. The Notice of Enforcement to have a time-frame within which works must be completed.

The refusal of permission should not only take into account the new drawings which have been presented but also the statements made in the Design and Access statement,

Maintenance for roofs can be perfectly addressed through the installation of a fall arrest hook and the provision of a harness to facilitate maintenance on a 5-yearly basis. This provides CDM compliance without the need for unsightly handrails. Other flat roofs in the street are maintained perfectly well without the need for railings - which in this instance look suspiciously like the railings of a roof terrace.

Where did the top cornice go? One of the main reasons this building looks butchered is the loss of good quality original detail which is significant for the building and the streetscape. A band of painted cement render is in NO WAY adding to the significance of the building as claimed. Once again, reference to the ONLY approved application for this site shows this cornice in situ. It should be reinstated forthwith. The new window on the third floor (Jamestown Road elevation) was not on the original and only approved application for this site. This should be bricked in again. In fact, this application shows the windows as

application for this site. This should be bricked in again. In fact, this application shows the windows as bricked in - the only element in this current application which could or should be approved.

The Attic (it can't by any stretch of the imagination be called a mansard) windows on both elevations must be changed to the approved georgian-style sash windows. The clear plate glass is grossly incongruous with the rest of the building.

The installation of a 'juliet balcony' even with a locked gate, is clearly a case of post-rationalisation by the applicant, a device to 'make-good' something which should never have been built in this way. The applicant must be enforced to rebuild to the only approved application, which is a georgian-style sash window to match those on the other two elevations. The design and access statement refers to the 'the intention of the Juliet balcony to allow the doors to be opened for fresh air and views to the outside'. It is our argument that a sash window, as originally approved, would more than provide the same views and fresh air without giving access to what is clearly an unauthorised roof terrace.