

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/1038/P	Jonathan Hill	16/04/2021 18:27:03	OBJ	<p>The design statement refers to the 'eclectic' rear facades of the houses on the north side of Regent's Park Road, which is the opposite side of the road to this planning application. Consequently, the architect's reference is deceptive because the south side of Regent's Park Road is not eclectic. It presents a consistent sequence of stuccoed early nineteenth-century facades with carefully proportioned window openings and projecting bays. In stark contrast, the proposed extension would be a fully glazed 'lantern'. No adjacent house in this section of the south side of Regent's Park Road has a modern glazed extension at upper ground floor. The proposed glazed extension would be brightly illuminated at night and visually intrusive in daylight. Therefore, we strongly object to the application, which is clearly out of context, incongruous and detrimental to the setting.</p> <p>Professor Jonathan Hill Dr Izabela Wiczorek</p>
2021/1038/P	Bob Gabriel	17/04/2021 21:39:41	OBJNOT	<p>I am the owner of a garden and raised garden level maisonette at 15 Regents Park Rd, NW1 7TL. My property is going to be adversely impacted by the proposals at 13 Regent's Park Rad (application ref: 2021/1038/P). I would like to make the following comments in respect of the proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The DAS makes reference to a supporting planning statement submitted with the application. However, this document is not available on the Council's website. It would be helpful to have sight of this document in order to try and more fully understand the justification for the proposals and a determination should not be made until the application is complete; • The proposals will have an overbearing impact and create an unacceptable sense of enclosure to my property, especially my main living room. • Despite the fact that the proposals appear to adhere to the 45 and 25 degree rules the proposal will have a detrimental impact upon the sunlight and daylight to my property due to its proximity to my windows and the resultant height of the flank wall. There will also be a detrimental impact upon rooms within the hoist property and a full Sunlight and Daylight Assessment should be provided accordingly. Without such thorough assessment the proposals are contrary to Policy A1 of the 2017 Adopted Camden Local Plan which seeks to manage the impacts of development including outlook, sunlight and daylight and overshadowing. • The proposed glazed extension will be south facing and therefore suffer from overheating in the summer and heat loss in the winter. There does not appear to be sufficient ventilation to counter this. The proposals will not provide an acceptable living environment or represent an environmentally friendly form of development. The development will be contrary to the 2017 Adopted Local Plan Policy CC2 which requires development to be resilient to climate change. • The property is located within the Primrose Hill Conservation Area and, if permitted, this development will be the first of its type in the road and could set a worrying precedent with similar developments having a cumulatively significant detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposals do not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and are therefore contrary to 2017 Adopted Local Plan Policy D2 which seeks to protect the character and appearance of conservation areas. • The proposals are of a design which does not respect the local context and character and are therefore contrary to 2017 Adopted Local Plan Policy D1 which seeks to ensure high quality design. <p>Given the above I respectfully request that the proposals are refused.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/1038/P	Richard Simpson for Primrose Hill CAAC	18/04/2021 12:18:08	OBJ	<p>ADVICE from Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee 12A Manley Street, London NW1 8LT 7 April 2021</p> <p>13 Regent's Park Road NW1 7TL 2021/1038/P</p> <p>Strong objection</p> <p>The house is one of a pair, with no. 15, and is part of a group which are formally identified as making a positive contribution to the conservation area. The significant characteristics which have been identified in the Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement (2001) – current SPD – at p. 9, include the elements of symmetry, and the projecting bays which contribute to that symmetry.</p> <p>The proposal would seriously harm these significant elements of the pair of houses. The addition to the raised ground floor is specially damaging to the symmetry of the original building because of its height– in effect an additional storey – while the construction of the wall to the neighbours is especially obtrusive and makes things worse.</p> <p>To help achieve the objective of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the conservation area, the Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement (2001) specifies policy guidance for rear extensions. These include:</p> <p>PH25 Extensions and conservatories can alter the balance and harmony of a property or of a group of properties by insensitive scale, design or inappropriate materials. Some rear extensions, although not widely visible, so adversely affect the architectural integrity of the building to which they are attached that the character of the Conservation Area is prejudiced.</p> <p>PH26 Rear extensions should be as unobtrusive as possible and should not adversely affect the character of the building or the Conservation Area. In most cases such extensions should be no more than one storey in height, but its general effect on neighbouring properties and Conservation Area will be the basis of its suitability.</p> <p>PH27 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 acceptability of larger extensions depends on the particular site and circumstances.</p> <p>PH28 Rear extensions will not be acceptable where they would spoil an uniformed rear elevation of an unspoilt terrace or group of buildings.</p> <p>PH30 Conservatories, as with extensions, should be small in scale and subordinate to the original building and at ground floor level only.</p> <p>The proposal fails the PHCA policies for rear additions as our highlighted passages show.</p> <p>The proposals would neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.</p> <p>Richard Simpson FSA Chair</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/1038/P	Samantha Mayaveram	18/04/2021 11:43:42	OBJ	<p>Regarding the planning application (?2021/1038/P) it is worthy of note that the existing maintenance of the property in question and previous developments have only be possible via trespassing across the neighbouring property on account of the limited access into the property. This has not been sought and previously when builders were asked to refrain from using the adopted access that was not a right of way, they have been objectionable and rude and failed to comply. This has also resulted in damage and access without permission.</p> <p>The noise of the development and that which will result from the unnecessary glazed addition will result in disturbance whilst taking place, and then will be an unavoidably obtrusion, reflecting the sun by day and radiating light from within at night. This would be further exacerbated by the disturbance of noise when complete and in use.</p>
