

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/6010/P	Elaine GOODMAN	04/02/2021 18:19:28	OBJ	<p>I object strongly to the erection of a further storey on 37 Primrose Hill Road.</p> <p>My husband and I have lived in the area for many years dating back to 1969 and almost 26 years ago finally moved on to the Quickwood Estate which over the years has remained unspoilt and in its' original form. We appreciated the thought behind the good architectural design with smaller houses in the centre bordered by taller houses, giving a variety of living space for different size families in two storey, three storey and four storey homes.</p> <p>The attractive design allows for maximum light into the communal gardens and properties on the estate and the spacing and height currently protects the privacy of the residents' homes and allows uninterrupted views. Adding an additional storey to 37 Primrose Hill Road would completely block the view from properties situated behind, destroy the uniform roofline of a row of terrace houses and be out of character of the estate and impinge on neighbours' privacy.</p> <p>All the houses on the estate have flat rooves and roof lights to allow extra light into the homes. An extra storey on a house next door would block this light and cast shadow over the roof lights. Should a homeowner chose to install solar panels in support of helping the environment an extra storey on a house next door would block the light needed to activate the panels.</p> <p>Extra storeys will bring increased traffic to the area with larger houses owning more cars.</p> <p>The variance in residents' ages and differing sizes of households has helped to establish a strong community spirit which has been in the forefront over the years and especially important during Covid 19. Sadly there now appears to be selfish resentment that some homes are only occupied by a single person or couple who are considered to be taking up too much space. Many of these homeowners have lived on Quickwood since it was built.</p> <p>I support fully the idea that the Twentieth Century Society considers the Chalcots' buildings (of which Quickwood is a part) to be Non-Designated Assets (NDHAs) and considers the estate estate to be worthy of conservation status.</p> <p>Reading through all the comments from those supporting this planning application it would appear that several are from people living outside Quickwood. They, personally, would not be affected by the inconvenience, noise and disruption from any development work so I would ask whether they have the right to comment on what does not directly affect them and only affects Quickwood homeowners.</p>
2020/6010/P	Helen Janecek	02/02/2021 14:15:57	OBJ	<p>As a nearby resident of the Quickwood sector of the Chalcots Estate I object to this planning application on the grounds that no assessment has been undertaken of the impact on rights of light to neighbouring dwellings. It is unclear whether an engineering assessment has been made of the ability of the foundations to support an additional storey. The 20th Century Society in its submission relating to a recent application for an extension to a dwelling at 25 Primrose Hill Road made a number of arguments which remain valid as regards this application. The proposed extension to this property would clearly, as other objectors have stated, ruin the architectural integrity of the terrace of which it forms part.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/6010/P	Kim Gieske	04/02/2021 17:36:55	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to this application with the following reasons:</p> <p>1. I [REDACTED] am aware that my neighbours from 13-23 do not want extra storeys on their houses therefore if no.37 built an extra storey it would look extremely unsightly/odd. 2. A survey was taken showing that the majority of residents were against the building of an additional storey. 3. It would spoil the architectural character and logic of the estate i.e. smaller houses in the centre and taller on the outside. Please note that the Twentieth Century Society considers the estate to be a Non-Designated Heritage Asset and worthy of conservation status. 4. It would negatively impact the privacy and views of other houses, particularly those with roof terraces on Quickswood. 5. It would impact the light on the communal garden and on to those houses nearby. 6. A major building project would cause significant disruption with various vans blocking parking spaces, made even worse by Number 37's location on the corner of Primrose Hill Road and Quickswood, 7. the noise levels would be upsetting to the elderly residents who live on the estate and to those working from home.</p>
2020/6010/P	Zahra	29/01/2021 18:49:11	SUPPRT	<p>This is a welcome project as it is both aesthetically pleasing and is carried out by the current owners for their personal use. It is not part of a property development scheme.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/6010/P	Carmel Lewin	03/02/2021 11:53:02	SUPPRT	<p>I support this application.</p> <p>1 Design</p> <p>The proposals for an extra storey are in keeping with the architectural design of the house and the character of the area generally. By repeating the design of the second floor almost exactly, using the same materials and the same arrangement of windows the design cannot be considered to be anything other than in keeping with its neighbours and this sector of the estate as a whole.</p> <p>It is clearly nonsense to say that 4 storey houses are out of character with an area that includes 4 storey houses as part of the original design. Furthermore it is also clear that the character of the area comes from the consistency of the materials and fenestration used in the houses rather than the height as there are three different heights of house already.</p> <p>Other comments on similar current applications have been made that the some houses in the terrace building upward extensions and other not doing so would give a haphazard effect, or look like broken teeth. I would disagree with this. In the first instance it is likely that given housing pressure in London and the value of such extensions, that over time all the houses in the terrace will extend upwards. Secondly a haphazard roofline does not necessarily destroy architectural integrity. If one looks at Chalcot Square, the roofline is not uniform with each upward extension dealt with differently with quite a range of designs. This doesn't particularly impact on the architectural quality of the square, in fact it is hardly noticeable because what has most impact is the regularity of the terrace and the consistency of the fenestration and entrances. It is exactly the same case here, the consistence of the window size and arrangement, and the use of consistent materials are the dominant architectural features, not the roofline.</p> <p>Furthermore many of those objecting to an inconsistent roofline seem to have forgotten the inconsistent treatment of the ground floors of the houses. These have a range of treatment across the estate and even across the terrace with some houses having converted the garages into living spaces and therefore changing the garage doors to window and others not. It should be noted that across the estate there is a huge variety in the treatment of these changes.</p> <p>This estate is in my view a lovely place to live, however that does not make it of any architectural merit. The estate was featured in the Architectural Review at the design stage, in a half page article showing the model, and stating that the project was going ahead. The article made no comment on the architectural quality of the final built design and the project was not reviewed once completed. I can also find no record of it having won a single award for the quality of its architecture when it was constructed.</p> <p>2. Daylight and Sunlight</p> <p>Many objectors have claimed that an additional storey will cast shadows into the communal gardens and reduce the amount of daylight and sunlight in the communal garden, and reduce light into other properties. It should be noted that at this time a daylight study has not been carried out to assess these very general claims and therefore there is no evidence to back up these assertions. As the terrace on Primrose Hill Road is to the east of the communal garden any effect on the light will be in the mornings when the sun rises, and it is probably true to say that direct sunlight will reach the garden slightly later in the morning if the entire terrace is built up, however no one has quantified how much later, it may be a very small percentage of the overall number of hours of direct sunlight that the garden receives each year, and may not affect the gardens during time when it is actually used. The majority of the direct sunlight of course comes from the south, over the roof of the church and will not be impacted by extensions on Primrose Hill Road.</p> <p>3. The Twentieth Century Society letter regarding designation as a conservation area</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>Several objectors have referred to the Twentieth Century Society's view on the estate. Having been approached by a resident of the estate keen to block upward extensions, the Society has written to Camden asking for the area to be considered for designation as a Conservation area Area. It should be noted that the society made a similar request (though in that case it was for the entire estate including the tower blocks) in 2004 that was rejected by Camden. It should also be noted that though the Society claim they have long believed the estate worthy of Conservation area status they did not include it in their Potential Conservation Areas scoping report of December 2017, even though 50 areas were listed as proposed new conservation areas. Furthermore though the society states in its letter that it considers the estate to be Non-Designated Heritage Assets, it is not included in the Camdens Local List. Lastly, one of the Societies draft criteria for recommending that an area be considered for conservation area status is that there should be 'minimal degradation' of the architectural quality and built form. A survey of the houses carried out by an architect showed that there was not a single house in the sector that had not been altered in some way. The vast majority have replaced the metal windows with UPVC, many garages and car ports have been replaced with windows (with a wide variety of designs adopted), Roof terraces have been built upon and rear extensions constructed. Even the common parts have been affected with the original open design destroyed by blocking off all the entrances to Adelaide Road and some of the gardens enclosed with plastic fencing. To assert that the estate is 'unsplotted' is a total nonsense.</p> <p>4. Privacy and Overlooking Comment have been made with regard to privacy and overlooking. The estate has been designed in such a way that every property is overlooked by the others. Residents can see across the gardens and roads straight into each others rooms. Additional stories will make this no worse than it already is.</p> <p>5. Residents views Some objectors have referred to a survey of the opinion of the households on the estate, with a result that 52% of the household are against extra storeys on the estate. It should be noted that one household who wished to vote a day late was not included, and another did not receive an invitation to take part, both have said they would have voted in favour of upward extensions. It is clear that the residents of the estate are fairly evenly divided in their view of this issue. It was also not made clear to those taking part that the results of the opinion survey would be used for planning purposes or be made public.</p>
2020/6010/P	Cheng Nowell	04/02/2021 17:41:03	OBJ	<p>I have lived on the estate since 1970 and have always enjoyed the open nature and the layout of the estate. I believe building an extra storey would spoil this. I also love the views from my roof terrace and I would be very upset if my views were disrupted. As an older resident the thought of constant building work that would be disruptive and noisy isn't something I relish particularly as I live very close to no. 37. Finally, please consider the impact that this will have on people's privacy and light into their houses and on to the communal garden.</p>
2020/6010/P	Taner Hassan	02/02/2021 11:55:38	SUPPRT	<p>I would support the application. I have lived in Belsize Park for over 15 years and have enjoyed the amenities and village-like atmosphere. It is a shame that when families grow, given space restraints, there is a "push" factor to move out from the area - the area is geared up for families but does not have affordable family homes. Also, given the change in working environments over the last 12 months, really important to have the space to WFH whilst children are being home schooled and we can expect working environments to be changed for good following the eventual opening up of the lockdowns. The ability to increase the space in the Dakins' existing home is I think a good solution.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/6010/P	Kenneth and Amanda Elliott	01/02/2021 12:07:44	PETTINOBJ E	We entirely support the letter submitted by the Twentieth Century Society to make the Quickswood section of the Chalcoats Estate a conservation area on the grounds that it is a unique, well-preserved, example of 1960s/70s architecture, providing an open and attractive place to live. It is of special character and makes a contribution to Primrose Hill as a place to live. The fact that it has to date been preserved in its original state is an important part of its attraction and if the Holly Lodge Estate in Highgate and other small estates in the area can be made into conservation areas we can see no reason why it is not important to give Quickswood the same status. Random additions by way of additional storeys would ruin it visually.
