

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/2146/P	Richard Simpson for Primrose Hill CAAC	05/07/2020 12:47:51	OBJ	<p>ADVICE from Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee 12A Manley Street, London NW1 8LT</p> <p>1 July 2020</p> <p>14 Regent's Park Road NW1 7TX      2020/2146/P</p> <p>We advise on 5 issues as follows: we object to 3 of the 5 issues.</p> <p>1. the front area screen replaced by door – no objection.</p> <p>2. the addition of further air-conditioning – strong objection. Air-con was not permitted under 2008/1987/P or 2014/3867/P, so there should be no air-con in the house let alone further air-con. We object strongly to the installation of air-conditioning in houses and flats where natural ventilation, including cross-ventilation, is possible. We note that Camden's Local Plan, Policy CC2 'Adapting to climate change', requires 'all development' (and not only those proposing 5 residential units or more) to adopt appropriate climate change adaptation measures, spelling out, in para. 8.39 'The Council will discourage the use of air conditioning and excessive mechanical plant.' At para. 8.42 'Active cooling (air conditioning) will only be permitted where dynamic thermal modelling demonstrates there is a clear need for it after all of the preferred measures are incorporated in line with the cooling hierarchy.' We fully endorse Camden's policy CC2 and ask for it to be upheld. Conservation of our environment in its most basic sense is at risk from climate change: every one of us has a role to play in addressing climate change. We understand that the Council has now agreed that we are in a climate crisis: it is critically important that this is seen to be carried through in appropriate policy and implemented through effective development management. We note that the Local Plan requires all preferred measures to be undertaken before active cooling is permitted. In this case this should include the testing of the effects of internal insulation and means of enhancing the natural air-flows which exist in this dual aspect house.</p> <p>3. the rear – loss of main window at lower ground floor – we object to the loss of the main lines of the elevation, which should be followed through in the new work.</p> <p>4. extension of rear extension – no objection.</p> <p>5. the digging out of the garden – objection. The digging down will not only require underpinning of the boundary walls, it will tend to create a sump from which natural drainage will be difficult. The requirements for permeability of ground to natural rainfall runoff would be put into question. The garden should not be paved which would also prejudice permeability. How would the area be naturally drained?</p> <p>Richard Simpson FSA Chair</p>