

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/4766/P	Gunnar Thorarinsson	04/12/2018 17:59:25	OBJ	<p>To whom it may concern.</p> <p>I've lived on Gloucester Avenue with my family for more than 10 years and we pass the corner where this former storage building is located, almost on daily basis. The structure used to be barely noticeable from the street, but now it dominates the corner. I object to the development because the raised roofline, new rendering application and windows overlooking the street do not fit the character of the neighborhood. Allowing this type of development, whether prospectively or retrospectively, is at odds with Camden and Primrose Hill planning guidelines. Allowing this development sets a very dangerous precedent for the conservation area. The building works already in place are in my view not in character with the neighbourhood. Any changes or disruptance to the holistic appearance of Gloucester Avenue have to be carefully considered, which I don't believe to be the case with this particular application. In my view it is particularly important to be mindful and protective of the overall appearance of the wider Primrose Hill village in light of outside threats to both value of property and quality of living with the HS2 being imposed on us. I trust and sincerely hope that Camden planning will take consider this carefully.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/4766/P	Francois Ivernel	04/12/2018 14:14:34	OBJ	<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.</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. 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 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 is directly visible from most of the principal back rooms of our house, including the living area where we spend the most time.</p> <p>Reasons we object to the proposed variation and development are:</p> <p>Overlooking, artificial light and we would see from above into what is now intended to be used as a bedroom cum bathroom.</p> <p>This would invade 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 (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 our property, specifically onto our kitchen and dining area and living area. This reduces our privacy and enjoyment of our property.</p> <p>Application 2017/2170/P included one window, fitting the character of the property, for back the room 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.</p> <p>Loss of light/reduced daylight</p> <p>The change in height and width of the back structure is a significant issue for us as it creates loss of light amenity.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>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 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
2018/4766/P	R Halliwell	09/12/2018 20:10:07	OBJ	<p>We wish to lodge an objection to the proposed plan. This work is being done in a conservation area but the windows are out of keeping with both Gloucester Avenue and Edis Street. The entrance on Edis Street can not comply with the conservation area regulations in terms of height, materials and appearance. The proposed rendering also does not comply with any other building in either Gloucester Avenue or Edis Street.</p>