

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/5570/P	Roddy Monroe	28/12/2020 22:16:21	OBJ	<p>The primary objection is that the planned erection of an additional 3m storey would be completely out of character with the sector which clearly depends on the uniformity of appearance of the houses. The design of the estate, with smaller houses in the centre bordered by taller houses, is thoughtful, attractive and has stood the test of time. Additional storeys will spoil it irreversibly.</p> <p>The effect on the architectural integrity of the estate would be particularly bad if one but not all houses in any row added an extra storey, destroying the uniform roofline and creating a haphazard and messy effect.</p> <p>An additional storey will intrude on the privacy of neighbours and block light onto their properties. The houses are set apart at distances appropriate to their current height and scale.</p> <p>An additional storey will cast a shadow onto the communal gardens. The gardens would be overlooked and get darker, with a reduction in the hours of sunlight.</p> <p>The addition of an extra storey is a major building project, likely to cause significant disruption, with lorries, cranes and skips coming and going. There are 67 houses on the estate &amp; the disruption could go on for years.</p> <p>Granting permission for the addition of even one extra storey would create a damaging precedent which would be detrimental to the whole sector for many years.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/5570/P	Lillian Shapiro	29/12/2020 18:53:21	OBJ	<p>I object strongly to this planning application by my near neighbour on a number of grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. #25 PHR is in the middle of a terrace of houses, all of which have flat rooves. I am in #13, and am aware that my neighbours from #13 – 23 inclusive do not want extra storeys to be built onto this terrace, and will not do so on their houses. I believe several houses on the other side of #25 feel the same. If #25 were given permission to build, the resulting jagged skyline would prove to be an eyesore.</li> <li>2. An external survey of the opinion of the 67 households on the Quickwood estate was completed by an impressive 87% of householders, showing the strength of feeling involved, with the result that 52% are against the addition of extra storeys on the estate. As it happens, this is the exact majority result that led to Brexit. The survey was commissioned by the Quickwood Residents' Association and conducted under Market Research Society rules by Sapio Research.</li> <li>3. The houses on the estate all have flat rooves, with several rooflights letting in a lot of light to the rooms and the floors below. An extra storey would cast a shadow on their neighbours' rooflights and block the important light flow coming into their houses.</li> <li>4. The Quickwood Estate was designed with smaller houses in the centre bordered by taller houses for a particularly good architectural reason – it not only looks very attractive, but it allows sufficient light into the gardens and houses throughout the estate. This thoughtful design would be completely spoiled by the addition of extra storeys.</li> <li>5. The Twentieth Century Society considers the Chalcots buildings (of which Quickwood is part) to be Non-Designated Heritage Assets (NDHAs) and considers the estate to be worthy of conservation status.</li> <li>6. Additional storeys would also undoubtedly interfere with the privacy of other householders, and have an adverse impact upon the light entering into other properties and the views those properties enjoy.</li> <li>7. The two storey houses in the centre enjoy lovely bright light (sunshine permitting!) in the morning, making their kitchens a lovely place to have breakfast. Extra storeys on PHR would destroy this.</li> </ol>
2020/5570/P	Anne Maka	21/12/2020 12:03:25	NOBJ	<p>We think this is a reasonable approach and that the whole community would benefit from the ability to extend the properties which will make them much more relevant with the way we live in the 2020s - especially in a post Covid world where so many people are working from home. The houses and community was designed for families and we should do what we can to continue to make it an attractive place for families and owners of all ages. I believe that over time most residents would want a extension, especially as properties change ownership.</p> <p>Let's embrace the future together and find a constructive way forward.</p>
2020/5570/P	Sara Cooper	19/12/2020 12:02:08	SUPPRT	<p>I would like to support this application and feel it would be an excellent way to provide extra living space to the existing house, with a design which is in keeping with the architecture of the estate.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/5570/P	Adam Simmonds	29/12/2020 16:51:15	OBJ	<p>I object to the proposal for the following reasons:</p> <p>The new storey would spoil our view from all floors of our house. We currently enjoy a pleasant view of the Grade II listed St Mary's Church and surrounding trees. This view would be ruined.</p> <p>The proposal would reduce the amount of light entering neighbours' houses and cast shadows into the communal gardens, reducing the available hours of sunlight.</p> <p>One house with an additional storey in a terrace of fourteen would remove the current uniformity of the roof line. Unless the whole terrace were to be extended, it would appear incongruous and out of keeping.</p> <p>I support the idea from the 20th Century Society to make Quickswood a conservation area to protect its architectural heritage and prevent haphazard alterations such as the proposed extension.</p> <p>Section 4.2 of Camden's Planning Guidance Altering and Extending Your Home states that a roof alteration is likely to be unacceptable if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Complete terraces have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions;</li> <li>- Buildings already higher than neighbouring properties where an additional storey would add significantly to the bulk or unbalance the architectural composition;</li> <li>- Buildings whose roof construction or form are unsuitable for roof additions;</li> <li>- Buildings designed as a complete composition where its architectural style would be undermined by any addition at roof level;</li> <li>- Where the scale and proportions of the building would be overwhelmed by additional extension.</li> </ul> <p>Clearly this application would be in breach of a number of these rules.</p>

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>
2020/5570/P	David Shorrock	29/12/2020 12:08:06	OBJNOT

**Response:**

Comments as follows:

- (i) Encroachment on adjacent properties: The Proposed Front Elevation, Proposed Rear Elevation and Proposed Roof Plan drawings show that the additional storey crosses the boundary line of the adjoining properties, numbers 23 and 27 Primrose Hill Road. This encroachment constitutes trespass.
- (ii) Loss of light: The Cover Letter claims that there is no loss of light caused by the proposed development. This is incorrect. As built, all the houses (numbers 11 to 37) in the Primrose Hill Road terrace have three roof lights. The extra storey will overshadow the adjoining properties (23 & 27). The importance of the roof lights to the internal ambience and habitable rooms of the properties is well illustrated by the application; the Proposed Roof Plan shows the need for four (not three) roof lights.
- (iii) Architectural Merit: The Cover Letter claims that "the existing property is in the style typical of the Estate and is not considered to be of a significant architectural merit". This assertion is questionable given that the Estate, by Dennis Lennon and Partners, was featured in the Architectural Review (Vol. 139, Issue 827, Jan. 1, 1966) and that number 25 forms part of an unspoiled terrace fronting Primrose Hill Road, as shown in the original architect's model.
- (iv) Overshadowing and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF): the mitigation of climate change is recognised as a material consideration under the NPPF and the NPPF recognises the positive contribution that can be made to climate change by even small-scale renewable energy schemes. However, the overshadowing caused by the addition of an extra storey would preclude the installation of solar panels on either of the adjoining properties (23 & 27).
- (v) Fire Safety: The Proposed Second Floor Plan takes no account of the Building Regulations Part B, Fire Safety, Volume 1, Dwellings. Given the open plan nature of the properties, as constructed, there is no protected stairway. For the additional storey, which will be above 7.5m, there is no alternative escape route, and there is no fire resisting construction to separate the storeys.
- (vi) Network Rail running tunnels: The property sits directly above the northern Primrose Hill Tunnel. Please can LB Camden confirm that Network Rail are a consultee to this application.
- (vii) High Alumina Cement (HAC): The Quickswood Sector was the First Phase of the Chalcots Estate and was constructed in the mid-1960's. The roof and floors of the houses were constructed using HAC, which was effectively banned by the Department of the Environment in 1974, due to the collapse of a number of buildings. In 1976 Clarke, Nicholls and Marcel, Consulting Engineers, were commissioned to report "On the structural stability of the High Alumina Cement beams situated at suspended floor and roof levels". This was a desk-based study and the conclusion, from their examination of the drawings and calculations based thereon, was that the concrete had reached its lowest strength and that they were satisfied that the floors were structurally stable and would remain so. The conclusion does however contain two important caveats:
- a. "It must, however, be pointed out that no visual inspection has been made and therefore any faults that may present in the houses at this time have not been taken into account and our report is based on a design check, assuming the dwellings to be in good condition"; and

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>b. "It is important that regular maintenance is carried out and especially that any water penetration should be corrected as soon as it occurs".</p> <p>This report and the conclusions therein are now some 44 years old.</p> <p>It should be noted that within the last 20 years, the roof of number 25 Primrose Hill Road has been resurfaced with asphalt twice in order to resolve water ingress.</p> <p>It should also be noted that at another development underway in the Quickswood Sector, the HAC roof and internal floors have been removed and replaced with materials that are compliant with current standards of construction.</p> <p>(viii) Underpinning: It should be noted that a number of houses on the Quickswood sector have required underpinning. In the case of houses where rear extensions have been added, in many instances the basements of the villas that previously stood on these grounds have been discovered. The lack of proper remediation of the site prior to construction in the 1960's might explain the use of a 'concrete raft' rather than more traditional foundations.</p> <p>Conclusions:</p> <p>With regard to items (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv), it is requested that consent should be refused.</p> <p>If LB Camden is minded to grant Prior Approval, then it is requested that conditions on the consent be imposed so as to address items (v), (vi), (vii) and (viii). With regard to item (vii) in particular, it is requested that it be a condition that investigations are conducted to identify whether any conversion of the HAC roof beams has occurred, and that the roof structure is capable of supporting any additional load.</p>
2020/5570/P	Aviad Kobrin	19/12/2020 15:37:38	SUPPRT	<p>Hi, my wife and I are the owners of 73 Quickswood NW3 5AJ which is situated across the communal garden from the property which sought upward extension. We support the extension as it allows more living space and falls in line with Government intention, as reflected in recent revised planning law, to allow such upward expansion.</p>