

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/5827/P	Hampstead CAAC	07/04/2019 21:47:32	OBJ	HCAC does not perceive provision of proper drawings of the proposed bin store for this application. No indication of entrance.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/6048/P	Dave Thomson	07/04/2019 12:17:17	OBJ	<p>We are writing to you to submit our objection to planning application 2018/6048/P</p> <p>Our objections to this development are directly related to loss of privacy and noise impact.</p> <p>Point 5.3 of the proposed application includes the construction of a balcony which will be mere metres from our property. This balcony would have direct, unobstructed view into our garden and kitchen.</p> <p>It can be reasonably assumed that the balcony will be used for drinking and barbeques in the Summer. As there is nothing acting as a barrier, any activity on the balcony would directly affect us and this combined with the direct view onto our property would be a significant impact to our quality of life and force us to curtail our activities.</p> <p>The spacing between the properties on Hemstal Road and Dynham Road is simply too close to enable the construction of extensions above the ground floor level without impacting others.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/6147/P	Richard Simpson for Primrose Hill CAAC	04/04/2019 18:24:06	NOBJ	ADVICE from Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee 12A Manley Street, London NW1 8LT 3 April 2019 St Mark's Church Prince Albert Road NW1 7TN 2018/6147/P No objection. We would welcome reassurance that the cabinet is free-standing, that is, on its own foundation, and would not be attached to the stone boundary wall to which it is adjacent. Richard Simpson FSA Chair

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/0452/P	Richard Simpson for Primrose Hill CAAC	04/04/2019 11:27:36	NOBJ	<p>ADVICE from Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee 12A Manley Street, London NW1 8LT</p> <p>20 March 2019</p> <p>34 Gloucester Crescent NW1 7DL 2019/0452/P + 2019/0687/L</p> <p>We have no objection of principle to the wholesale repair of the existing slate roof. We note that the intention is to re-fix existing slates, replacing broken slates as required using 'matching natural slates'. We are concerned that these replacement slates should indeed be matching, which, we understand, would mean natural Welsh slate. This would achieve consistency of appearance, important in a Listed Building, but also consistency of weathering. We understand that the Crown Estate requires the use of Welsh slate for repairs to the roofs of its Listed Buildings in the area.</p> <p>Richard Simpson FSA Chair</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/0467/P	glen robinson	06/04/2019 10:23:46	NOOBJEMP ER	I am the freeholder of the neighbouring property 18 Eton Garages. I am writing to support this application as I personally think that the application has no adverse impacts on the mews and the environs and in fact is a beneficial to the area.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/0468/P	Richard Simpson for Primrose Hill CAAC	07/04/2019 18:01:02	OBJ	<p>ADVICE from Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee 12A Manley Street, London NW1 8LT</p> <p>20 March 2019</p> <p>Flat 4th Floor 31 Gloucester Avenue NW1 7AU 2019/0468/P</p> <p>Strong objection.</p> <p>The Committee welcomed the Council's refusal of application 2018/1123/P, and the grounds for refusals referring to both the Listed Building – no 31 is part of a Listed terrace – and to failure to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.</p> <p>The Committee noted the ways in which the current application was modified from the 2018 application, but advises that these modifications to not meet the grounds for refusal in 2018, which remain applicable to the 2019/0468/P application.</p> <p>In brief, and we refer to our advice on 2018/1123/P, we again draw attention to the terrace of which 31 is a part, as recognized in the Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement – the formal SPD for the CA – at p. 11 as a 'grand terrace', one of two terraces exceptional in their sub-area, and described as 'discretely designed to form symmetrical compositions'. The symmetrical character of this terrace is identified with its pattern of shallow projecting bays at ends and centre. The application property constitutes one of these end bays.</p> <p>The proposed revised roof extension would be seriously harmful to this recognized symmetry of the Listed Building by disrupting the rhythms of the projecting bays at the roofline, a major element in the formal 'shape' of the terrace as a whole. The roofline is prominent in longer views, and the bringing forward of the front enclosure to the front of the chimney stacks would mean that the proposed extension would be highly visible in long views. This would harm the larger symmetry and the horizontal divisions of the terrace, for example the attic level.</p> <p>The proposal would, again, harm the significance of the Listed Building.</p> <p>In terms of the conservation area, we also note that the application property, and the whole terrac</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/0468/P	Richard Simpson for Primrose Hill CAAC	07/04/2019 18:01:23	OBJ	<p>ADVICE from Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee 12A Manley Street, London NW1 8LT</p> <p>20 March 2019</p> <p>Flat 4th Floor 31 Gloucester Avenue NW1 7AU 2019/0468/P</p> <p>Strong objection.</p> <p>The Committee welcomed the Council's refusal of application 2018/1123/P, and the grounds for refusals referring to both the Listed Building – no 31 is part of a Listed terrace – and to failure to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.</p> <p>The Committee noted the ways in which the current application was modified from the 2018 application, but advises that these modifications to not meet the grounds for refusal in 2018, which remain applicable to the 2019/0468/P application.</p> <p>In brief, and we refer to our advice on 2018/1123/P, we again draw attention to the terrace of which 31 is a part, as recognized in the Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement – the formal SPD for the CA – at p. 11 as a 'grand terrace', one of two terraces exceptional in their sub-area, and described as 'discretely designed to form symmetrical compositions'. The symmetrical character of this terrace is identified with its pattern of shallow projecting bays at ends and centre. The application property constitutes one of these end bays.</p> <p>The proposed revised roof extension would be seriously harmful to this recognized symmetry of the Listed Building by disrupting the rhythms of the projecting bays at the roofline, a major element in the formal 'shape' of the terrace as a whole. The roofline is prominent in longer views, and the bringing forward of the front enclosure to the front of the chimney stacks would mean that the proposed extension would be highly visible in long views. This would harm the larger symmetry and the horizontal divisions of the terrace, for example the attic level.</p> <p>The proposal would, again, harm the significance of the Listed Building.</p> <p>In terms of the conservation area, we also note that the application property, and the whole terrac</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/0468/P	Richard Simpson for Primrose Hill CAAC	07/04/2019 18:00:36	OBJ	<p>ADVICE from Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee 12A Manley Street, London NW1 8LT</p> <p>20 March 2019</p> <p>Flat 4th Floor 31 Gloucester Avenue NW1 7AU 2019/0468/P</p> <p>Strong objection.</p> <p>The Committee welcomed the Council's refusal of application 2018/1123/P, and the grounds for refusals referring to both the Listed Building – no 31 is part of a Listed terrace – and to failure to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.</p> <p>The Committee noted the ways in which the current application was modified from the 2018 application, but advises that these modifications to not meet the grounds for refusal in 2018, which remain applicable to the 2019/0468/P application.</p> <p>In brief, and we refer to our advice on 2018/1123/P, we again draw attention to the terrace of which 31 is a part, as recognized in the Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement – the formal SPD for the CA – at p. 11 as a 'grand terrace', one of two terraces exceptional in their sub-area, and described as 'discretely designed to form symmetrical compositions'. The symmetrical character of this terrace is identified with its pattern of shallow projecting bays at ends and centre. The application property constitutes one of these end bays.</p> <p>The proposed revised roof extension would be seriously harmful to this recognized symmetry of the Listed Building by disrupting the rhythms of the projecting bays at the roofline, a major element in the formal 'shape' of the terrace as a whole. The roofline is prominent in longer views, and the bringing forward of the front enclosure to the front of the chimney stacks would mean that the proposed extension would be highly visible in long views. This would harm the larger symmetry and the horizontal divisions of the terrace, for example the attic level.</p> <p>The proposal would, again, harm the significance of the Listed Building.</p> <p>In terms of the conservation area, we also note that the application property, and the whole terrac</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/0608/P	R. GOULD	04/04/2019 19:16:03	OBJ	OBJECTION THERE IS EXTENSIVE WORK ALREADY AT THIS SITE AND I DO NOT BELIEVE THEY HAVE ALL THE CORRECT PERMISSIONS IN PLACE. CAMDEN PLANNING AND/OR BUILDING CONTROL SHOULD VISIT AND INVESTIGATE.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/0638/P	John O'Rouke	07/04/2019 06:37:09	OBJEMPER	Dear Sir/Madam

I wish to lodge an objection for the proposed building works planned for 16 Pakenham Street, London WC1X 0LG and I am writing on behalf of my elderly mother who lives at no 15, the adjoining property.

Having reviewed the application, we do not support the application for the following reason:-

1) Health Issues

- a. My mother (80) suffers from ill health, which has made her house bound and is unable to leave the property unless accompanied. Her only access to natural light is her garden area, which will be virtually out of bounds due construction activity. This added to the increase to dust in the local vicinity will irritate her chest as she uses an inhaler to move around the house and garden.
- b. Resident also at the property is my mentally handicapped sister, who is virtually house bound and requires a wheelchair when taken out by her carers – again loss of access to the garden will cause both physical and mental distress.

2) Access Issues

- a. The property can only be accessed from the front
 - i. Excessive noise will be generated
 - ii. Potential problems if the pavement area requires to be shut off as it will impede wheelchair access for my sister
- b. We do not give permission for access to our garden for any work, which most likely will be required to complete the extension – noting that it is suggested a wall is demolished between the properties?

3) Previous dispute

- a. Some 15 years ago, significant work was undertaken at no 16, where the appropriate party wall agreement was not in place prior to work commencing
 - i. This resulted in solicitor letters at which times my retired parent (father now deceased) felt the legal process favoured no 16 as they offered recourse post building only
 1. Note post rather than pre
 2. My father at the time was a night worker and all building work took place during the day without due regard to his health
 - b. It was also noted at the time, excavations for the previous work were dug under my parents' house

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/0638/P	John O'Rouke	07/04/2019 06:37:47	OBJEMPER	Dear Sir/Madam

I wish to lodge an objection for the proposed building works planned for 16 Pakenham Street, London WC1X 0LG and I am writing on behalf of my elderly mother who lives at no 15, the adjoining property.

Having reviewed the application, we do not support the application for the following reason:-

1) Health Issues

- a. My mother (80) suffers from ill health, which has made her house bound and is unable to leave the property unless accompanied. Her only access to natural light is her garden area, which will be virtually out of bounds due construction activity. This added to the increase to dust in the local vicinity will irritate her chest as she uses an inhaler to move around the house and garden.
- b. Resident also at the property is my mentally handicapped sister, who is virtually house bound and requires a wheelchair when taken out by her carers – again loss of access to the garden will cause both physical and mental distress.

2) Access Issues

- a. The property can only be accessed from the front
 - i. Excessive noise will be generated
 - ii. Potential problems if the pavement area requires to be shut off as it will impede wheelchair access for my sister
- b. We do not give permission for access to our garden for any work, which most likely will be required to complete the extension – noting that it is suggested a wall is demolished between the properties?

3) Previous dispute

- a. Some 15 years ago, significant work was undertaken at no 16, where the appropriate party wall agreement was not in place prior to work commencing
 - i. This resulted in solicitor letters at which times my retired parent (father now deceased) felt the legal process favoured no 16 as they offered recourse post building only
 - 1. Note post rather than pre
 - 2. My father at the time was a night worker and all building work took place during the day without due regard to his health
 - b. It was also noted at the time, excavations for the previous work were dug under my parents' house

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/0638/P	John O'Rouke	07/04/2019 06:37:22	OBJEMPER	Dear Sir/Madam

I wish to lodge an objection for the proposed building works planned for 16 Pakenham Street, London WC1X 0LG and I am writing on behalf of my elderly mother who lives at no 15, the adjoining property.

Having reviewed the application, we do not support the application for the following reason:-

1) Health Issues

- a. My mother (80) suffers from ill health, which has made her house bound and is unable to leave the property unless accompanied. Her only access to natural light is her garden area, which will be virtually out of bounds due construction activity. This added to the increase to dust in the local vicinity will irritate her chest as she uses an inhaler to move around the house and garden.
- b. Resident also at the property is my mentally handicapped sister, who is virtually house bound and requires a wheelchair when taken out by her carers – again loss of access to the garden will cause both physical and mental distress.

2) Access Issues

- a. The property can only be accessed from the front
 - i. Excessive noise will be generated
 - ii. Potential problems if the pavement area requires to be shut off as it will impede wheelchair access for my sister
 - b. We do not give permission for access to our garden for any work, which most likely will be required to complete the extension – noting that it is suggested a wall is demolished between the properties?
- 3) Previous dispute
- a. Some 15 years ago, significant work was undertaken at no 16, where the appropriate party wall agreement was not in place prior to work commencing
 - i. This resulted in solicitor letters at which times my retired parent (father now deceased) felt the legal process favoured no 16 as they offered recourse post building only
 1. Note post rather than pre
 2. My father at the time was a night worker and all building work took place during the day without due regard to his health
 - b. It was also noted at the time, excavations for the previous work were dug under my parents' house
-

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/0709/P	Kathy Clauss	05/04/2019 10:47:53	OBJ	OBJECTION -- please see email from kathy.e.clauss@gmail.com sent to planning@camden.gov.uk on April 3rd 2019. Could i please have confirmation of receipt.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/0833/P	Richard Simpson for Primrose Hill CAAC	04/04/2019 11:07:57	NOBJ	<p>ADVICE from Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee 12A Manley Street, London NW1 8LT</p> <p>20 March 2019</p> <p>22A Chalcot Square NW1 8YA 2019/0833/P + 2019/1271/L</p> <p>No objection of principle, but there is inadequate information for an application for a Listed Building. What are the materials of the proposed rear infill extension roof, and how would potential problems of light pollution be addressed (noting the proposed rooflight)? There are no drawings or details of materials for the proposed repair to the front area steps: these are important in the Listed Building. There are no details of materials to be used in the proposed refurbishment of the front area: again, this is important in a Listed Building. We accept that these issues could be addressed as reserved matters, which is why we do not object.</p> <p>Richard Simpson FSA Chair</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/0899/P	Richard Simpson for Primrose Hill CAAC	04/04/2019 18:33:03	OBJ	<p>ADVICE from Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee 12A Manley Street, London NW1 8LT</p> <p>3 April 2019 44-44A Gloucester Avenue NW1 8JD 2019/0899/P</p> <p>Objection.</p> <p>We object on the grounds that the proposal would be visible in long views from Chalcot Road along Edis Street, and indeed in views from Edis Street itself. This would be harmful to the character and appearance of the conservation area, where such views are of recognized significance. We accept that it would not be visible from other locations in the CA.</p> <p>If it were to be shown in a verified section, drawn from the far side of Chalcot Road along Edis Street, to the railway line, that the proposal would not be visible, we would reconsider this objection.</p> <p>Richard Simpson FSA Chair</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/0972/P	Hampstead CAAC	07/04/2019 22:38:40	OBJ	Hampstead CAAC Objects to the addition of a car space which is contrary to Policy.
2019/0972/P	Hampstead CAAC	07/04/2019 22:38:29	OBJ	Hampstead CAAC Objects to the addition of a car space which is contrary to Policy.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1035/P	Hampstead CAAC	07/04/2019 23:06:09	COMMNT	HCAAC would suggest a less strident fascia to the car port and addition of a green roof.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1070/P	Zhigang Yuan	05/04/2019 10:58:10	OBJ	<p>As a resident and Leaseholder ,39 College Crescent, I strongly object to the change of use of the office (known until now as Lily's Kitchen) to D1 (Therapy Clinic) on the following grounds:</p> <p>Loss of office Space and unsuitability of D1 Use being permitted in this private and enclosed residential area 39 College Crescent is an unusual development where one office unit is embedded inside a residential terrace of private family homes. For this reason the conversion of this office into a clinic is not feasible and in breach with the residents rights to quiet enjoyment of their homes. Furthermore, : Camden has limited office space per the Camden Local Plan, and per the Camden Local Plan Section E2, office space should not be converted to other use unless "a). the site or building is no longer suitable for its existing business use; and b). that the possibility of retaining, reusing or redeveloping the site or building for similar or alternative type and size of business use has been fully explored over an appropriate period of time."</p> <p>Neither of these tests have been met. The space has only been vacant for a short while. Other suitable office tenants could be found, and there is anecdotal evidence that other tenants could be interested in the space.</p> <p>This development was designed to be 6 family homes with a locked single entrance from College Crescent. Office Use (B1 use) is suitable with the employees of the business utilising the premise during working hours (typically 9.00am to 5.30pm) from a planning perspective but D1 Clinic use is not a suitable use because it will have a very detrimental on the recreational and amenity space for the communal front gardens with patents having access up 10.00pm in the evening. Please note that all of these house have extremely small rear gardens and the front area is a crucial amenity space for the existing residential unit.</p>

The applicant made grave errors in their application:
The planning application says in secti

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1070/P	LILI ZHANG	04/04/2019 13:57:22	OBJ	<p>As a resident and Leaseholder ,39 College Crescent, I strongly object to the change of use of the office (known until now as Lily’s Kitchen) to D1 (Therapy Clinic) on the following grounds:</p> <p>Loss of office Space and unsuitability of D1 Use being permitted in this private and enclosed residential area 39 College Crescent is an unusual development where one office unit is embedded inside a residential terrace of private family homes. For this reason the conversion of this office into a clinic is not feasible and in breach with the residents rights to quiet enjoyment of their homes. Furthermore, : Camden has limited office space per the Camden Local Plan, and per the Camden Local Plan Section E2, office space should not be converted to other use unless “a). the site or building is no longer suitable for its existing business use; and b). that the possibility of retaining, reusing or redeveloping the site or building for similar or alternative type and size of business use has been fully explored over an appropriate period of time.”</p> <p>Neither of these tests have been met. The space has only been vacant for a short while. Other suitable office tenants could be found, and there is anecdotal evidence that other tenants could be interested in the space.</p> <p>This development was designed to be 6 family homes with a locked single entrance from College Crescent. Office Use (B1 use) is suitable with the employees of the business utilising the premise during working hours (typically 9.00am to 5.30pm) from a planning perspective but D1 Clinic use is not a suitable use because it will have a very detrimental on the recreational and amenity space for the communal front gardens with patents having access up 10.00pm in the evening. Please note that all of these house have extremely small rear gardens and the front area is a crucial amenity space for the existing residential unit.</p>

The applicant made grave errors in their application:
The planning application says in secti

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1070/P	Jennifer Akgul	04/04/2019 18:10:08	OBJNOT	<p>Dear Mr Benmbarek</p> <p>There is one woman and possibly more that are attacking me in emails to you and on the Camden planning site and on social media. They are saying I am against people with mental health issues and "disgusting".</p> <p>I just wanted to appeal to your good sense.</p> <p>Regarding the change of use from B1 office to D1 clinic.</p> <p>I would be opposed to any additional shop or clinic in 39 College Crescent that would bring additional foot traffic into the courtyard.</p> <p>The proposed D1 use is inherently incompatible with a residential area. It would involve a lot more activity than the office use.</p> <p>While no-one is prejudiced against people with mental health issues, it would not be appropriate for patients to be able to mix in an uncontrolled manner with residents' children in what is their only play area.</p> <p>The proposed use is not intended to serve the local community; it is to be a relocation from Wimpole St. It could relocate anywhere over a wide area.</p> <p>This is an opportunist application. It happens that the applicant owns the property, and he can doubtless save money by relocating here. However, that is not a reason for planning permission to be granted in the face of clear policy and local opposition within the development itself and on College Crescent.</p> <p>I am not stigmatising anyone with mental health conditions. I have family with mental health issues. A close family member has schizophrenia and we love her very much. That said she can't look after my two young children if they are alone with her. That is only sensible.</p> <p>I have been very hurt by these women attacking me. I have never been attacked before on social media and so it is a first and a learning experience.</p> <p>But I just hope you can look at this issue with a level head.</p> <p>Of course mental health provision is important and welcome in Camden.</p> <p>Just not in this residential development with a small office.</p> <p>If the applicant wants to move only administrative staff to the I</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1070/P	Zhigang Yuan	05/04/2019 10:59:53	OBJ	<p>As a resident and Leaseholder ,39 College Crescent, I strongly object to the change of use of the office (known until now as Lily's Kitchen) to D1 (Therapy Clinic) on the following grounds:</p> <p>Loss of office Space and unsuitability of D1 Use being permitted in this private and enclosed residential area 39 College Crescent is an unusual development where one office unit is embedded inside a residential terrace of private family homes. For this reason the conversion of this office into a clinic is not feasible and in breach with the residents rights to quiet enjoyment of their homes. Furthermore, : Camden has limited office space per the Camden Local Plan, and per the Camden Local Plan Section E2, office space should not be converted to other use unless "a). the site or building is no longer suitable for its existing business use; and b). that the possibility of retaining, reusing or redeveloping the site or building for similar or alternative type and size of business use has been fully explored over an appropriate period of time."</p> <p>Neither of these tests have been met. The space has only been vacant for a short while. Other suitable office tenants could be found, and there is anecdotal evidence that other tenants could be interested in the space.</p> <p>This development was designed to be 6 family homes with a locked single entrance from College Crescent. Office Use (B1 use) is suitable with the employees of the business utilising the premise during working hours (typically 9.00am to 5.30pm) from a planning perspective but D1 Clinic use is not a suitable use because it will have a very detrimental on the recreational and amenity space for the communal front gardens with patents having access up 10.00pm in the evening. Please note that all of these house have extremely small rear gardens and the front area is a crucial amenity space for the existing residential unit.</p>

The applicant made grave errors in their application:
The planning application says in secti

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1110/P	Hampstead CAAC	07/04/2019 22:56:36	OBJ	HCAAC Objects to this proposal. The proposed extension is inappropriate as excessive in size and scale dominant relative to the existing building and risking greater overlooking of neighbours.
2019/1110/P	Julie Harris	07/04/2019 18:21:59	OBJ	Dear Sirs, 2019/1110/P Flat 3, 37 Platt's Lane, LONDON NW3 7NN I wish to object to this application for the enlargement of an existing rear conservatory. The proposal will cause overlooking and intrusion for the other flats at no. 37 as well as neighbouring properties. I believe It is contrary to Camden's CPG "Altering and Extending Your Home" and "Amenity" and furthermore contrary to Local Plan policies - being too prominent and causing overlooking to flats 1 and 2 and a loss of their privacy and outlook. Finally this extension is not compatible with the character and appearance of the neighbourhood and not in line with Camden's commitment to protecting the Conservation status. Yours faithfully Julie Harris 2 b Briardale Gardens London NW3 7PP
2019/1110/P	Hampstead CAAC	07/04/2019 22:56:23	OBJ	HCAAC Objects to this proposal. The proposed extension is inappropriate as excessive in size and scale dominant relative to the existing building and risking greater overlooking of neighbours.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1133/P	Richard Simpson for Primrose Hill CAAC	04/04/2019 12:06:13	OBJ	ADVICE from Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee 12A Manley Street, London NW1 8LT

20 March 2019

Flat A 20 Fitzroy Road NW1 8TX 2019/1133/P

Objection.

The Committee noted that main issue for the Committee is the proposed extension beyond the original, and largely surviving, rear building line. This is set by the rear wall of the existing, and original, back addition. The site plan submitted shows that the proposal would, exceptionally, go well beyond this rear building line. This would not only diminish the garden, it would go against policy-guidance PH27 in the Primrose Hill Conservation Area statement, current SPD, which states that 'Extensions should be in harmony with the original form and character of the house and the historic pattern of extensions within the terrace or group of buildings'. The full width-extension, beyond the rear building line, would, taken together, be substantially out of harmony with the original, and surviving form of the house. It is clear that the original brick rear additions, continue to form a bold, simple, masonry mass within the multiple alterations that have been made around – but not beyond – them.

Given the arguments made by the applicant on the basis of precedent, we are also concerned that any approval would be used as a precedent in the future.

Any modified scheme which might be acceptable would also need to address problems of light pollution.

Richard Simpson FSA
Chair

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1163/P	Haines Phillips Architects for Nicole Holmes for	05/04/2019 12:40:49	COMMNT	<p>We are instructed by Nicole Holmes of Flat 3, 87-89 Marchmont Street. Our Client is so concerned at the adverse affects of this application that she has requested this Practice make objection on her behalf and as follows:</p> <p>The applicant has made no attempt to engage in any prior consultation with any stakeholders such as our Client. This application our Client feels will have a detrimental impact upon enjoyment of her residence and is amazed no prior consultation took place despite the supporting statement stating "full consideration has been given to neighbours" . That is not the case.</p> <p>The applicants supporting Statement simply refers to adding vibrancy and employment to the area without any reference to specific policies. It seems to fail to distinguish between a 'generic' neighbourhood and the specific Neighbourhood Centre of Marchmont Street/Leigh Street/Tavistock Place which the site lies within and referred to in Appendix 4 of the Local Plan. It also states it would add to employment benefit without giving any details particularly the number of proposed employees and current employees to be displaced. its reliance on a "desert parlour" use differing from a "cafe" use is disingenuous. It is a flimsy Statement which lacks credibility.</p> <p>Specific Policy TC1 requires an appropriate provision of shopping in the Neighbourhood Centre. A more than appropriate provision of "soft A3 uses" already exists here. there are 2 cafes out of 9 frontages on Tavistock Place, 6 out of 36 on Marchmont Street and 2 out of 15 on Leigh Street. Further A3 pub/restaurant uses total 15. Thus in all some 26 A3 uses out of 60 frontages in the Neighbourhood centre, already a significant over provision of 43%.</p> <p>Policy TC2 states a maximum of 25% of such uses. also that no more than 2 such uses should be consecutive. The proposed change of use lies between the Lord John Russell PH and the Fork Deli Cafe. Any consent would be in flagrant disregard of this stipulation which, despite the existi</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1265/P	A. McGrath	06/04/2019 10:07:03	COMNOT	<p>The location of the vehicle charging points on the east side of Make peace Avenue is entirely unsuitable. Although electric car charging points on the estate is good idea, the east side of Makepeace Avenue is already congested with cars as it is more densely populated with residents living in the mansion blocks compared to the avenues on the west side of the estate which are comprised of a much smaller number of residents living in relatively fewer houses. As a result there's much less pressure on space for parking. The proposed location is also already overcrowded with a number of electric and telephone exchange boxes, a post box, a storage box for sand. The proposed location for the charging points would add to this overcrowding by adding an electric supply and meter cabinet with a retaining wall, 4 x charging posts for 6 extra cars from anywhere on or off the estate and a speed bump. It would adversely affect the look of this part of Makepeace Avenue and there is much more space where this proposed plan would be less conspicuous and on the quieter areas of the estate where it will more easily blend in. Also, parking on both sides of that part of the avenue makes it difficult to turn into the east side of Makepeace Avenue from Hillway.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1295/P	Richard Simpson for Primrose Hill CAAC	04/04/2019 18:39:27	NOBJ	<p>ADVICE from Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee 12A Manley Street, London NW1 8LT</p> <p>3 April 2019</p> <p>The Albert, 11 Princess Road NW1 8JR 2019/1295/P</p> <p>No objection.</p> <p>The PHCAAC was consulted pre-application, and we note that the proposed sedum roof to the proposed conservatory would largely address our concerns about light pollution.</p> <p>We would also want to see sound attenuation measures (such as internal finishes) to protect residents in Auden Place on Calvert Street from noise from the pub interior.</p> <p>We note that, although there is disabled access to the garden from Kingstown Street, there is no step-free access between the garden and the interior of the pub. This needs to be revised.</p> <p>We appreciate the comment that the existing planting to the Calvert Street wall will be retained.</p> <p>The PHCAAC and the PH Community Association jointly successfully applied for The Albert to be registered as an Asset of Community Value, and we wish to see the pub use successfully resumed.</p> <p>Richard Simpson FSA Chair</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1325/P	Ron Ganbar	04/04/2019 17:49:10	OBJ	<p>My worry is that the school might increase pupil intake. This means for the neighbours an increase of traffic during the drop-off and pick-up hours, which is already horrendous.</p> <p>It seems that every child is picked up in a car. The parents arrive early and park anywhere, and wait in the cars engine idling. Crossfield road turns into a single way road at these times and it's a nightmare. The council needs to do something to curb the traffic situation (not to mention the extra pollution) before this is approved.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1667/P	Aidan Doyle	06/04/2019 16:11:04	INT	This land was I believe bought with an undertaking that there would be no building work put upon it and it although tidied up in recent years still an attractive habitat for wildlife I believe that this building will take away from that fact and i wish to object . The applicant can build a garden shed in his garden
2019/1667/P	Aidan Doyle	06/04/2019 16:11:13	INT	This land was I believe bought with an undertaking that there would be no building work put upon it and it although tidied up in recent years still an attractive habitat for wildlife I believe that this building will take away from that fact and i wish to object . The applicant can build a garden shed in his garden

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1773/P	David Reed	06/04/2019 16:03:20	OBJNOT	<p>OBJECTION FROM SAVE SWISS COTTAGE ACTION GROUP, representing hundreds of local residents.</p> <p>THIS PROPOSAL MUST BE REJECTED IN ITS ENTIRETY: THIS IS THE ONLY OPEN AREA IN THE WHOLE OF SWISS COTTAGE and is used by thousands of children and older people every day.</p> <p>The destruction of this section of the park will massively reduce the amenity of the whole park. The area concerned is the MAIN ENTRANCE ROUTE from the west and the northern routes will also be severely impacted, reduced to narrow tracks on unsatisfactory surfaces, making disabled access very difficult.</p> <p>IN ADDITION, this is almost the only FLAT open space in the whole park!</p> <p>Finally, the trees to be destroyed are a KEY PART of the AVENUE running through the whole site, their removal will DESTROY this avenue and their replacements will take at least a decade to reach the maturity of the present ones.</p> <p>For all of these reasons this use of this key section of the park MUST BE REJECTED. The developers knew from the VERY START that this site was NOT SUITABLE for the massive over-development they have proposed and their UTTER FAILURE to adjust their plans to meet the difficulties is ENTIRELY THEIR PROBLEM.</p> <p>They must not be allowed to destroy OUR PARK, IT IS THE ONLY OPEN AREA IN THE WHOLE OF SWISS COTTAGE!</p>

Total: 22