

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/2839/P	Hayley Cameron	08/08/2020 19:45:18	OBJ	This will make already small flats on Priory Terrace feel even more cramped as they look directly onto a wall. In these small London flats, some small kind of view is a great relief particularly if future lockdowns have to be imposed. These flats will undoubtedly not be affordable and not justified.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/2839/P	Flat owner	08/08/2020 15:40:06	COMMNT	<p>Dear Ms Hope</p> <p>I wish to object to the proposal, as an owner of a flat at 37 Priory Terrace. I am concerned that I was not included in the list of neighbouring consultees. The list of consultees appears to be very short indeed and is not representative of the impact of this application. Only one out of four flats at 37 Priory Terrace was officially informed and this is questionable.</p> <p>This proposed house is overdevelopment of a small plot, is detrimental to the townscape, neighbouring structures and occupiers, and has sub-standard living quarters.</p> <p>Other grounds for objection include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Scale and massing (size and height) <p>This house is too large and not subservient to the separated host building. It is too prominent in the streetscape and should not be so close to no.39, as it creates an uncomfortable, dark crevice between structures and limits outlook from no.39. The outlook from Priory Lodge is also affected.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Overdevelopment <p>The proposal should not have a basement – this is overdevelopment of a small plot of one garage and some left over garden.</p> <p>Proximity to no39 could cause potential structural, outlook, privacy and sense of enclosure impacts. The proposed new house invokes a historic structure attached to the main house at no.39, but this is separate from it and negatively impacts the original house.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Basement structural impact <p>At 37 Priory Terrace we have experienced significant cracks and subsidence. This basement threatens the integrity and stability of the surrounding properties, especially the immediately adjacent no.39 Priory Terrace, and the basement should be removed from the proposal.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Basement – quality of bedroom accommodation <p>The quality of light and outlook in the two basement bedrooms is poor. There is no proper outlook and it is over-development.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Housing type and need – this purports to be a 3-bedroom family home but it is laid out as three double bedrooms with double beds. Clearly therefore this is proposed as a rental to three couples and not as a family home. If the naming of this proposal is to somehow meet family housing need then it should perhaps be re-categorised as three bed rental accommodation. <p>The living area only has seating for four people shown, not six.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Amenity – the bike store and paths consume much of front garden, and whilst solar panels are mentioned they are not shown on the roof plan so the total amenity, whilst perhaps achieving the minimum required for a 3-bed home, may not be adequate in reality. If three couples occupy the house they might cause disturbance to surrounding occupiers when using the roof terrace. Conversely the occupiers of this proposal using the roof terrace may feel overlooked and not secure in their privacy. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Lack of information : solar panels <p>Solar panels are noted but not shown on the drawings or in the 3d visuals – they should be added.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. Misleading visuals : solar panels and bike store; shaded building not in sunlight. <p>As above the solar panel(s) not shown and the bike store is not in the visuals; the 3d visual puts the proposal in shade to minimise its impact whereas it should be shown also in sunlit conditions, where it will be prominent and dominant in the street and conflict with the host building.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9. Design and Appearance <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The extension is not subordinate to the main house, by virtue of not being set back in plan. The line of the frontage to Priory Terrace is in the same alignment as the host building but the extension should be recessed back from this line to make it subservient. The detached house is not an extension either of the host building.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>b) The large bedroom window onto Priory Terrace may echo the proportions of the windows in the road but those windows are set into much bigger elevations, whereas the tiny façade of the proposal is not capable of having such a large black opening in it without resultant dominance and dissonance. The proposed dark bronze window framing etc do not match the neighbouring buildings which have white timber fenestration.</p> <p>c) The house sits right on the pavement edge, creating an uncomfortable pedestrian realm and experience.</p> <p>d) In a Conservation Area, proposals should preserve or enhance the character and appearance – this does not abide by that tenet as it is intrusive.</p> <p>e) Prominence, dominance and conspicuousness – when the sun is from the east/south east the building will be lit and the white box will be prominent. The rear façade of brick is also too dominant.</p> <p>10. Construction Phase</p> <p>The construction management plan is vague about lorries delivering and parking, and the location of skips. Without clear information there would be congestion and disruption for at least the 13mths proposed in the programme.</p> <p>11. Very limited neighbour consultee list – unacceptable. Has the church opposite been consulted? The setting is affected.</p> <p>12. Use of adjacent garage – question the feasibility in terms of vision splays and sightlines if this house was built.</p> <p>It is hoped that this application will be refused. The existing site needs improvement but not unsuitable and inappropriate over-development.</p>

2020/2839/P Rebecca Cowper 08/08/2020 23:45:58 OBJ

Having read the documents submitted, and living very close to the Priory Road Conservation Area for many years, I would like to strongly object to this planning application for several reasons:

- The excavation of the presented building will, with all certainty, create undesirable ground movements which will affect the stability, the structure and possibly even the safety of the inhabitants of the buildings nearby. The ground in this area is already quite unstable and such digging may have serious consequences.

The proposed construction is too close to the pre-existing buildings, such as 39 Priory Terrace, which may get severely damaged. Number 37 Priory Terrace and the garage and cottage nearby may suffer detrimental impact to their structure.

- It is also worth mentioning that the disruption may not only affect the structure but the ambience of one of the prettiest and better preserved Conservation Areas in NW. We must keep into consideration that the buildings all around are houses and flats where people live! Their lives will be massively disrupted, not only because of the physical damage their building will most likely undergo and the related expenses their owners will have to bear to repair them. There is risk of psychological impact to local residents, including anxiety generated by the construction of a horribly excessive building compared to the tiny space available. The potential detrimental effects on the mental health of the inhabitants of this area must be considered.

- The appearance of the structure presented would be in total disagreement with the fine and elegant architecture of this Conservation Area and looking at the presented plan it looks like it won't provide acceptable standards for a residential building.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/2839/P	37 Priory Terrace	09/08/2020 14:29:48	OBJ	<p>Dear Mr Hope</p> <p>Further to my objection of yesterday, I raise further concerns on the consultation process, as it appears that no neighbours were consulted, only the statutory consultees.</p> <p>Of the utility companies/HSE consulted, on two occasions the wrong map and address were used ie for Priory Road, not Priory Terrace.</p> <p>In terms of the address noted in the details, it says 'Garages and Land Adjacent etc' whereas it is only one garage that is on the site of the proposed application.</p> <p>As previously noted yesterday, this proposal is over-development, should not have a basement, should be subservient to 39 Priory Terrace by being set back from the front elevation of that existing house, should not have a basement, has negative impacts on the streetscene, townscape, setting of the church, adjacent buildings, and structural integrity of neighbouring properties including no.37 which has suffered subsidence and cracks; should not purport to be a family home when laid out as a rental property for three couples; will affect the amenity of surrounding residents due to the roof terrace, is far too close to the side elevation of 39 Priory Terrace causing loss of amenity and a claustrophobic feeling of enclosure; will be overlooked by the tower blocks across the road and other neighbouring occupiers; has materials and colours of the windows that are not compatible with the 'host' building and houses in Priory Terrace, Priory Road or neighbouring streets. The 3d visual renderings are not representative of when the proposed building will be in sunlight on the white rendered elevation - which will show the house to be more dominant in the context and streetscape; and the size of the large window on Priory Terrace is out of proportion with the proposed elevation.</p> <p>Fundamentally this is over-densification of a pocket site on a prominent street corner, and should be rethought and redesigned. Please refuse this application.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p> <p>Owner of a flat at 37 Priory Terrace</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/2839/P	Miss Patel	09/08/2020 22:26:48	OBJNOT	<p>Having reviewed the planning submission, I object to the following aspects of this application:</p> <p>PRIORY ROAD CONSERVATION AREA: The site is within the Priory Road Conservation Area, "an area of special architectural interest or appearance of which it is desirable to improve or enhance" as defined by planning guidance.</p> <p>The proposed elevations should therefore be of high quality design and not simply mimic the linear external plaster mouldings of the neighbouring properties along Priory Terrace, or copy the brickwork along Abbey Road as an attempt to blend in. The sharp junction between the white render and brickwork on the Abbey Road elevation results in a fragmented box.</p> <p>MASSING: The semi-detached villas along Priory Terrace have side passages with a separating brick wall between each villa. These give access to the rear garden from street level and also provide light to windows on the side elevation. The proposal should be pulled away from the Party Wall to continue this pattern, instead of enclosing onto it, which disrupts the visual break between villas along the street and significantly reduces amount of daylight received to the kitchen, bathroom and bedroom at No.39 Lower Ground Floor flat.</p> <p>The side elevation along Abbey Road should be further set back to be in line with other properties along Abbey Road.</p> <p>CTMP: The sole access to the Lower Ground Floor flat at No.39 is via the side passage. This is shown within the construction site area on the CTMP drawings with hoarding blocking the front entrance door - how does the applicant propose the owners/occupiers access the flat?</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/2839/P	Suzanne Szczetnikowicz	09/08/2020 13:23:22	OBJ	<p>Conservation Area</p> <p>Having reviewed the plans contemplated for the new building, it is proposed to take up a small area at the end of Priory Terrace and looks nothing like all of the other buildings at this end of Priory Terrace. As a conservation area, it is understood that the council should only be permitting developments that preserve or enhance the appearance of the neighbourhood. Whilst the proposed site is presently occupied by two garages, this is not, as has been presented, a derelict area and it is clear that the nature of the building will be at odds with the buildings on Priory Terrace. Its impact will not be enhancing to the lives of the owners of the immediately surrounding buildings.</p> <p>Loss of privacy</p> <p>Given that there are very few roof terraces in the immediate area, having this one at that lower height and the windows overlooking number 39 will impact significantly the visibility that people would have from that roof terrace directly into the buildings.</p> <p>Subsidence and double basement concerns</p> <p>A significant concern for those in the immediately adjacent properties (numbers 37 and 39), is the fact that a double basement is contemplated. 37 Priory Terrace has had a history of subsidence, which has in the past caused real issues for purposes of achieving buildings insurance (with significant premia at multiples of what would otherwise be achievable) and as a result for ensuring ability to acquire mortgages for properties, which typically require specific subsidence coverage. As this matter has only recently been resolved for the building at number 37, owing to prior insurers having to bring back workman to complete priory shoddy foundation work, there is real and well placed concern about the impact that any such development would have on the stability of the foundations of these two structures. We would have absolutely no recourse to the builders of the proposed new property and yet our buildings and accompanying insurance / financing arrangements would clearly be affected based on recent experience.</p> <p>Solar panel usage</p> <p>Have surveys been undertaken to assess the impact of such solar panels being included within the bounds of the property as far as reflective characteristics towards the other surrounding buildings?</p> <p>Building approach</p> <p>It is unclear from the plans how builders will access the site, where skips and other materials will be located and how it is proposed that the impact on what is a very busy and important thoroughfare will be minimized. When traffic builds up on Abbey Road, through use of temporary light systems, as has been the case recently, those houses that are located at this end of Priory Terrace are interrupted by the noise of car engines, additional pollution in the air and also through additional car horns. This has all been made even more evident by the recent COVID experience meaning that many of us have been working from home. Separately, I would query where it is proposed that any bins would be located as putting them on the corner of the street will likely cause barrier to pedestrians and create mess until the bin men have been.</p> <p>Lack of consultation</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>In light of the above and given the proximity to the buildings at numbers 37 and 39 and the movement of the space towards full residential use, it is surprising to say the least that very few local residents have been consulted. Worth noting that a large proportion of this area is not owner-occupied but is instead tenanted, so the council should absolutely bear in mind that this will likely be the use outcome of any residential building being built on that plot. This means that there will be a disproportionate increase in noise and people traffic coming from the structure and access impediments both during construction and afterwards once the structure is free-standing.</p> <p>I therefore strongly object to the proposal in it's current form and to the lack of consultation that has been afforded the local residents.</p>
2020/2839/P	Rowena Kasprowicz	10/08/2020 06:53:41	OBJ	I object to this application and fully support all the points raised in the Objection made by the residents of the adjacent building at N. 39 Priory Terrace.
2020/2839/P	Mike Gill	09/08/2020 14:49:25	OBJ	This looks unacceptably out of character with everything else in Priory Terrace, and in a very exposed and visible location, it's north east corner
2020/2839/P	Cleyde Vieira da Silva	09/08/2020 23:12:52	PETITNOBJ E	As a resident on Priory Terrace I hereby oppose to the construction of this horrendous looking property. The proposed property will be architecturally disruptive to the appearance of the Conservation Area, therefore it is certainly incompatible with the architectural heritage of Priory Road Conservation Area.
2020/2839/P	Jamie Scattergood	09/08/2020 09:57:21	OBJ	I mirror the comments that my fellow priory terrace residents have raised and, along with many of us on the street reject this proposal wholeheartedly. This is a conservation area and I'm also concerned about the subsistence issue. We'd be grateful if it could please be rejected and as residents we are happy to explain our concerns further. Many thanks, Jamie

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/2839/P	Luke Petre	07/08/2020 23:17:35	OBJ	<p>I object to the proposed Planning Application 2020/2839/P for the following reasons:</p> <p>PRIORY ROAD CONSERVATION AREA</p> <p>- The proposal is not consistent with the appearance and character of the area. Particularly the roof terrace and the modern finish of the windows will not be in keeping with the architectural finish of the surrounding buildings.</p> <p>EXCAVATION OF BASEMENT</p> <p>- The proposed excavation may create movement in the ground and may damage the buildings in the immediate neighborhood. As my building is across the road from these works, I am very concerned to read about the risk of settlement and subsidence in the structural engineer's statement.</p> <p>INTRUSION INTO NEIGHBOURS PRIVACY</p> <p>- The proposed roof terrace will overlook into neighbors' homes and gardens. The garden at #39 Priory Terrace and Flat 1 and 2 in 134 Abbey road will experience a significant reduction in privacy.</p> <p>PROLONGED DISRUPTION TO NEIGHBORHOOD</p> <p>- The proposed works are scheduled to take at least 13 months, with considerable levels of noise and disruption of traffic on Abbey Road. Also, consider that there are considerable redevelopment works planned on the nearby Emminster and Hinstock estates.</p> <p>LACK OF INITIAL CONSULTATION</p> <p>- The freeholders of the properties opposite the proposed building, including my freehold at 134 Abbey Road, were not consulted about this proposal.</p> <p>I do not object to the development of this site as a three-bedroom property. It is unfortunate that I did not have an opportunity to discuss my objections before the planning application was submitted.</p>
2020/2839/P	Isobel Faiers	09/08/2020 23:06:41	OBJ	<p>I own a property in close proximity to the proposed dwelling and would like to object to the planning application on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conservation area - The plans for the building are not in keeping with the current aesthetic of the area. 2. Privacy and devaluation - The design of the property having a low roof terrace will infringe on the privacy of neighbouring properties which will in turn devalue these properties. 3. Proposed basement and subsidence risk - Most importantly, we have had issues already in Priory Terrace with subsidence. Digging a basement will undoubtedly cause further issues in the surrounding area resulting in disruption that is completely unacceptable and puts some of the other properties at risk.
2020/2839/P	D snijders	08/08/2020 20:03:38	COMMNT	<p>I object to the proposed building. The precedent of deep excavations is unwelcome to the area and jeopardises the stability of other buildings in the street.</p>