



Subject: Re; planning application (2021/2291/P and 2021/2904/L)



Dear Mr Marfleet,

I am the owner of the basement flat of 31 Gloucester Avenue, London NW1 . I am writing to strongly object to the planning application (2021/2291/P and 2021/2904/L) which has been made by the recent owner of the top floor flat.

I refer to the Report prepared by Paul Velluet the Chartered Architect that was prepared on behalf of my neighbour in Flat 3 in support of their objections. The points Mr Velleut makes and are highlighted below are in my view very serious :

Mr Velluet concludes (at 4.1 and 4.2) that: -

- ∞ Given the importance attached to ensuring the highest standards of design and in the alteration of listed buildings set out in Policies D.1 and D.2 of the *Camden Local Plan, 2017*; in Policies PH 18 and PH 19 of the *Primrose Hill Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy, 2000*; and in the relevant guidance on the alteration of listed buildings and on building services equipment contained in Sections 3 and 9 of *Camden Practice Guidance: Design* of January, 2021; and taking account of the Council's requirements in relation to applications for Planning Permission relating to listed buildings and conservation areas set out in Section 3 of *Camden's Local Area Requirements for Planning Applications* of 2018/August, 2020; the current applications as presently submitted do not provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the special interest of the application-property will be preserved in accordance with Sections 16 and 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 and its significance sustained in accordance with the relevant policies of the *National Planning Policy Framework*.
- ∞ Any decisions to approve the current applications as presently submitted would be premature given the significant omissions and anomalies in the documentation submitted in support of the applications as referred to in this report, and given the need to secure the satisfactory resolution of such omissions and anomalies before the applications may be properly determined after providing adequate opportunity to those directly affected to comment on the additional information.

In the circumstances I believe it would be very wrong to grant permission without a proper consultation on the amended drawings/documents. There is a collective pride in the house and its specially protected listing.

Mr Hart purchased the property knowing that the previous application had been refused and was fully aware of the size of the flat, which is a standard one bedroom flat. It would be extremely disruptive if he carried out such major works to the house as everyone is substantially working from home. In addition for those who rent their properties they would lose their rental income as tenants would not tolerate the level of noise and disruption.

Yours sincerely,

Perry Bamonte