

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/4192/P	John Van de North	10/10/2018 13:47:44	COMMNT	<p>Planning Application 2018/4192/P 79 Gloucester Avenue - Objections</p> <p>We object to this variance application for several reasons listed below.</p> <p>We object to all construction work that has been done without permission since the planning permission granted with 2017/2170/P. The current variance application needs to be reviewed in context of previous application 2017/2070/P which was allowed with revisions after commentary. Since the granting of that previous application the property has been sold and the present applicant has knowingly made unauthorized changes to the back building, including raising the roofline, raising a party wall, and adding wraparound windows, cladding and rendering the building. We note that work on this structure continues in earnest even subsequent to our request that permission be obtained through the proper channels, and even after a visit from a Camden planning inspector and an architect, both of whom we understand advised the applicant that planning consent was required.</p> <p>The building, which is now mostly built, has thus been constructed with blatant disrespect for the planning process. The resultant building, which violates planning guidelines and Primrose Hill conservation area guidelines, cannot be ignored. The applicant has almost finished building and is now seeking permission, with post-rationalisation, for significant deviation from the plans approved by 2017/2170/P.</p> <p>The current variation seeks to disregard the impact of raising the roofline. It refers to raising the roofline as a "minor adjustment". Drawings, elevations and materials for the proposed changes are not included in the application. This is insulting and disrespectful to the planning process. Camden and Primrose Hill planning guidelines contain significant processes for determining when a roofline may be raised, including the impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties (considering factors of visual privacy and outlook, sunlight, daylight and overshadowing, artificial light levels, and noise), and how the proposal impacts the character of the property.</p> <p>We have sent images of the view of the existing property from our house to the Camden planning email address. We ask that the roofline as approved in 2017/2070/P of the property be maintained and that no new windows or additional external rendering or additional cladding materials are permitted.</p> <p>We note that we did not object to the original plan to convert 79 Gloucester Avenue from an office into a 2 bedroom property, or the plans for the 2 bedroom property itself, which did not include raising the roof of the back structure or creating windows that overlooked our living areas and blocked our light. The back structure shares a party wall with our property and is directly visible from most of the principal back rooms of our house, including the living area where we spend the most time. Thus, its use as low level garage/storage room that did not overlook our house was critical to our decision to purchase 81 Gloucester Avenue, and we were aware at the time of purchase that many protections are in place through Camden regarding raising the roofline, preventing overlooking, etc.</p> <p>Reasons we object to the proposed variation and development are:</p> <p>Overlooking and artificial light</p> <p>The proposed new windows overlook our property. They provide a direct line of sight into our kitchen/dining area, principal living area, a shower, a bathroom, and our garden. The proposed new windows about a party wall with our property, and are between 5-6 feet from windows in the aforementioned rooms. This impinges our privacy, would allow overlooking, and cause lighting and noise problems. At night, we would have new pollution from these windows from artificial lights.</p> <p>Any proposed attempt to mitigate the overlooking using frosted windows would also have a detrimental impact on our quality of life. First, we will always see the windows, and movements behind them, from our kitchen table and living area and bathrooms (we suspect that the windows are at head height). Furthermore at night, frosted windows will cause the nuisance of artificial lighting due to light spillage and light trespass onto</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

our property, specifically onto our kitchen and dining area and living area. This reduces our privacy and enjoyment of our property.

Application 2017/2170/P included one window, fitting the character of the property, for the back-room of the property; with this window, the room will already have adequate light and ventilation. We did not object to this window and believe this should be sufficient. The room does not require wrap-around clerestory windows that overlook other properties, cast artificial light into other properties, and do not match the character of the existing building or surrounding buildings.

Loss of light/reduced daylight

The change in height and width of the back structure is a significant issue for us as it creates loss of light amenity.

The property has a pitched roof visible from the street and adjoining properties. Roof alterations are proposed, in narrative form, to change the shape and form of the roof making it a flat roof. While the application drawings do not detail this change, the work already done to the property without permission has raised the roof by approximately 3 feet. This change in height has a detrimental impact on the light available into critical rooms in our property including our kitchen and living room which sit below the raised roofline. The proposed elevation of the roof level from a sloped roof to a flat roof at street level creates a loss of light and we request that it be restored to its original profile.

Our light is also reduced by the addition of approximately 3 inches of cladding and rendering on the side of the building facing our house; this cladding is not mentioned in the application but has already been applied to the building in disregard of planning applications. This creates further loss of light and moves the structure closer to our house. The rendering of the cladding, in place of the original brickwork, fundamentally contravenes basic planning guidance for the conservation area.

Character of the area

Construction materials:

We strongly object to the materials used in the proposed development, including the use of cladding and rendering on the building, the style of the new windows, and roof materials. The application did not detail any materials to be used, but these materials have already been applied. They are publicly visible from the street and neighbouring properties including ours. The materials are not modest and cause harm to the character and amenity of the area, and the architectural character of the building. The rendering is not in harmony with the existing brick materials underneath the cladding. These materials should be retained wherever possible to maintain the character of the area. Moreover, the design, scale and materials proposed (cladding, rendering, clerestory windows) are not sensitive to the special qualities of the property; they undermine the features of the original building which is publicly viewable.

Proposed change to Glass covering of lightwell:

We also object to the proposed covering of the front lightwell with glass rather than a grille. This was already the subject of comments in the previous application and a flush fitting safety grille has already been approved as part of the planning process. A grille is more in keeping with the character of the property as a storefront. The Primrose Hill planning guidelines aim to protect this character.

We strongly request that this application is refused with a Notice of Enforcement action, which includes a time frame within which works must be reversed.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				Please advise us if it will be possible for us to attend your discussion of this matter and if so please let me know the date, time and location of your discussion.
2018/4192/P	Francois Ivernel	09/10/2018 15:23:42	OBJ	<p>We object to this variance in two aspects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. to the lighwell being varied from a metal grille to a glass covering. This is not in the style of the building. As owners of the top floor at same address we would be disturbed by artificial light emanating from the glass well and by the sight of the people using the place. 2. The new owner and applicant has made unauthorised works to the back building (a former garage being turned into a study). The roof has been raised with all-around windows added. From our rear window we can see inside this study, we will be disturbed by the light. Esthetically this is also not in the style of the area. This is built with poor material. What is presented as « minor adjustment » is indeed not a minor adjustment. We ask that the roofline as approved in application 2017/2070/P be maintained and proper materials used. <p>We ask that this application be refused and unauthorized works be reversed.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
2018/4192/P	Haleema Ali	20/10/2018 22:08:27	COMMNT	I object as the row of Windows give a view directly into my garden and rear room.They compromise the privacy in these areas of my house and home. They will also create artificial light to enter these areas which cause disturbance to the peace/relaxation of the room
2018/4192/P	Haleema Ali	20/10/2018 22:08:43	COMMNT	I object as the row of Windows give a view directly into my garden and rear room.They compromise the privacy in these areas of my house and home. They will also create artificial light to enter these areas which cause disturbance to the peace/relaxation of the room
2018/4192/P	Haleema Ali	20/10/2018 22:07:55	COMMNT	I object as the row of Windows give a view directly into my garden and rear room.They compromise the privacy in these areas of my house and home. They will also create artificial light to enter these areas which cause disturbance to the peace/relaxation of the room
2018/4192/P	Dana Haimoff	13/10/2018 10:00:01	APP	I live on Gloucester Avenue and have dealt extensively with the Camden building regulations for my own project, and I cannot believe that the back building of this house has been completely transformed without any regard to planning regulations -- and that approval is now being sought after the building is almost completely built! What used to be an unobtrusive corner now has a large concrete structure rising out of it. It looks like the roof of the former garage has been raised several feet and there are now windows all around the back building, visible from the street. The other part of the building is covered in rendering! This cannot be permitted. This development with its higher roofline and new windows seriously damages the charm of the area, which planning guidelines exist to protect. Allowing this development would set a very dangerous precedent for the area. I strongly object to this development - please do not permit it.