

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017:5573P	[REDACTED]	9 Chalcot Crescent Primrose Hill London NW1 8Y£	03/12/2017 16:35:11	OBJ	<p>As householders of 9 Chalcot Crescent (since 1979) we feel, reluctantly, that some objection must be made to the above Planning Application. Reluctant, because the greater part of the proposal - that of reconfiguring internal use and functions of rooms - is perfectly sensible, and arguably a form of restoration, reinstating a layout nearer to likely original social use. There can be no objection to this domestic rearrangement: but it is unfortunate that the application has been married, in the RPR Proposal Document, to plans for a completely inappropriate addition of a two-storey metal and glass structure ("Conservatory" is an ill-chosen description for what, in effect, is a large glass porch, with two-storey high swing doors) which, if erected, would irrevocably mar what is otherwise, mercifully, the largely unspoiled rear elevation of a handsome London mid-19th century terrace group. Furthermore, the alteration to the original ground-floor rear fenestration to feature a "Juliette (sic) balcony", in a sense purely to justify the unnecessary double height of this proposed structure, is surely something which should no longer be encouraged or condoned in a more enlightened era of Historic Building Planning.</p> <p>A single-storey infill conservatory, such as found in the adjacent no.6 Rothwell Street, despite its somewhat heavy architectural treatment, goes largely un-noticed owing to its lower-ground floor position. The two-storey structure proposed here, however, is a very different matter, in this proposal, such a brutal intervention in unsympathetic materials would simply be an unwarranted anachronism, one serving no true practical purpose, and certainly not contributing to "the continued future usability of the listed building" which its designer claims for it. Much is made, in this Proposal document of "The special historic significance of the listed group" lying "within the uniform architectural composition" which term, somewhat disingenuously, is applied here solely to the front facade - noticeably NOT to the rear elevations "not visible from roads or public footpaths". This is to imply that the 18 houses (and many more households) of Chalcot Crescent and Regent's Park Road, and their present and future residents, which DO overlook what is a shared, intimate and important, rear garden space, do not matter! This is shameful, and merely self-serving. Moreover, the assiduous citation of planning precedence by RPR Architects, who claim to be "Conservation Specialists", to justify an inappropriate two-storey intervention and quite unnecessary alteration to an original window, is a fundamental misreading of what Planning Policy in a Conservation Area guidelines signify: they are there, surely, to protect and preserve for future generations the existing worthwhile, and not to be hailed as a short-term pseudo-license to enable further architectural solecism. We regret that commendable internal alterations, to which we have no objection, have here been linked with an unnecessary, unsympathetic, visually intrusive, two-storey "conservatory" extension, which therefore give us no alternative but to our asking the Planning Committee to reject these proposals.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017:5573 P	[REDACTED]	9 Chalcot Crescent Primrose Hill London NW1 8Y£	03/12/2017 16:35:27	OBJ	<p>As householders of 9 Chalcot Crescent (since 1979) we feel, reluctantly, that some objection must be made to the above Planning Application. Reluctant, because the greater part of the proposal - that of reconfiguring internal use and functions of rooms - is perfectly sensible, and arguably a form of restoration, reinstating a layout nearer to likely original social use. There can be no objection to this domestic rearrangement: but it is unfortunate that the application has been married, in the RPR Proposal Document, to plans for a completely inappropriate addition of a two-storey metal and glass structure ("Conservatory" is an ill-chosen description for what, in effect, is a large glass porch, with two-storey high swing doors) which, if erected, would irrevocably mar what is otherwise, mercifully, the largely unspoiled rear elevation of a handsome London mid-19th century terrace group. Furthermore, the alteration to the original ground-floor rear fenestration to feature a "Juliette (sic) balcony", in a sense purely to justify the unnecessary double height of this proposed structure, is surely something which should no longer be encouraged or condoned in a more enlightened era of Historic Building Planning.</p> <p>A single-storey infill conservatory, such as found in the adjacent no.6 Rothwell Street, despite its somewhat heavy architectural treatment, goes largely un-noticed owing to its lower-ground floor position. The two-storey structure proposed here, however, is a very different matter, in this proposal, such a brutal intervention in unsympathetic materials would simply be an unwarranted anachronism, one serving no true practical purpose, and certainly not contributing to "the continued future usability of the listed building" which its designer claims for it. Much is made, in this Proposal document of "The special historic significance of the listed group" lying "within the uniform architectural composition" which term, somewhat disingenuously, is applied here solely to the front façade - noticeably NOT to the rear elevations "not visible from roads or public footpaths". This is to imply that the 18 houses (and many more households) of Chalcot Crescent and Regent's Park Road, and their present and future residents, which DO overlook what is a shared, intimate and important, rear garden space, do not matter! This is shameful, and merely self-serving. Moreover, the assiduous citation of planning precedence by RPR Architects, who claim to be "Conservation Specialists", to justify an inappropriate two-storey intervention and quite unnecessary alteration to an original window, is a fundamental misreading of what Planning Policy in a Conservation Area guidelines signify: they are there, surely, to protect and preserve for future generations the existing worthwhile, and not to be hailed as a short-term pseudo-license to enable further architectural solecism. We regret that commendable internal alterations, to which we have no objection, have here been linked with an unnecessary, unsympathetic, visually intrusive, two-storey "conservatory" extension, which therefore give us no alternative but to our asking the Planning Committee to reject these proposals.</p>