
From: Stephen Coe [REDACTED]
Sent: 13 October 2021 17:15
To: Kate Henry
Subject: '21/3409/P- 'FINS' disguised 'jettied glazing'.

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

Dear Kate..

Until the very recent publication of the revised Details - less than one month ago and only following my telephone call to you..

Full implication(s) of the 2017/8 permission - were not apparent on 2021/3409/P until the 3674/P section revealed the disguised content, from 3409/P.

I've been looking out for the 4/10/'21 Addendum to go on List.. but perhaps you've been in discussion with the Applicant.

Allowing permission for the very large "picture window" (on the front elevation) - to overshoot the building line over the street - sets a much 'larger precedent'.. for imitation - under Permitted Development - being of marginal dimensions within P.D. limits.

Who wouldn't want to push internal sill dimensions - through the room walls - to encompass a wider, partly 'jettied' glazing set-up? The outsize scale of this huge unit of partly frosted glazing, was never discussed in any terms of being appropriate in Mews.

& Jutting out in this manner - was barely noticeable in the initial plans - while the angled "FINS" concealed a projection of about 16cm.

I never saw reference to this in the Officer Report - either at Pre App Stage or later on - although I consistently drew attention - to this anomaly in my various comments - but it was "effectively" concealed - by the FINS cladding - until - made abundantly clear, on the 1:5 Detail Sections in 2021/3674/P - which only came to light on 14th September - when you kindly posted these - during our phone conversation. Had I not called you - no-one else would have seen those details - until if ever built perhaps..

Together with the other aspects of the FINS - not being within the compass of No. 17 - and 'concealing' the vast 'irregular' flank window - any such, being specifically excluded by legal agreement - from the outset. It is to be hoped - that these matters are finally getting the attention deserved.. if rather too late in the process, despite being recommended for discussion much earlier on - in P.A. phase.

Confidence in the known weaknesses within the process - is hardly a way to advance such ways around the obstacles. Or is it?

I realise this has been a most unusual application, resurfacing at this late stage - although unexpectedly and into your take-over.

I've consistently objected to these contentious 'external appendages' in comment, correspondence and in the only 'delayed' initial meeting with No.17- in October '17. & I cannot accept the highly repetitive geometric excess, bearing not the faintest relevance or suitability to the Mews environment in this our Conservation Area.

These 'FINS' would obstruct sight-lines east, from my only side-opening front window (despite my leaning out).

Apart from moving the 'flank glazing', (which will benefit neighbours) - to the rear elevation - within curtilage, to avoid further delays in contention; - I am simply suggesting this to facilitate - building the well-lit staircase with full area skylight, and commencing the internal layout to the benefit of both applicants (and neighbours) in early course.

Please keep me informed

Over to you..

Stephen