

① Ash ② JS
5/19/11/99

60A Marlborough Court,
Pembroke Road,
London. W8 6DF.

(68)

18th November 1999.

The Executive Director,
Planning and Conservation.

RECEIVED BY PLANNING SERVICES								
EX DIR	HDC	N	C	SW	SE	ENF	AO/ACK	
(39)		19 NOV 1999						
APPLS	IO	REC	ARB	FWD PLN	CON DES	FEEES		

Dear Sir,

Proposed development at 29 Pembroke Road
Our ref.: DPS/DCC/PP/99/02212/JS

I write in regard to the above subject on behalf of the Marlborough Court Residents Association, which is composed of leasees of flats immediately on the east side of the proposed development site.

We see no objection in principle to the provision of a dining room at ground level in the position indicated. However, we do object to the proposal to increase the height of the common boundary wall. I believe this wall has already been heightened and extended in the course of

(2)

~~(10)~~

(18)

works in 1989 (first floor extension), and possibly earlier works, and the wall as so detailed presents a formidable expense of bare brick to our residents who face it. A further increase of this expense would be unjustified.

The tree cover is an important consideration, and we note the rather vague phrase "evergreen conifers hedge modified". In our view there should be a condition requiring the retention of specified trees. We do not quite see how trees will be planted on a roof terrace, but this does not really concern us. We should however like a condition against planting heylandii trees.

We are worried that the harden plane tree may suffer from the foundation and building works. I am told (though I have no personal knowledge of this) that an ash tree died soon after the completion of the building works at the southern end of the plot, and a similar fate for the plane tree must at all costs be avoided.

I do not know what the legal status of the wall is, but this is a matter for the freeholders.

③

⑦⑩

①⑨

The inspection of the site might be a
mitable opportunity for seeing that the
earlier planning conditions have been observed

Yours faithfully,

M. J. D. J. D. J.

(MR. M. L. J. VNLAP)

Chairman, Marlborough Canal
Residents Association.



RAB MC C&M gen

Planning Committee
Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea
The Town Hall
Hornton Street
London W8 7NX

18th November 1999

Dear Sirs

Proposed building extension, 29 Pembroke Road, London W8 PP92212

99/2212

We are the Maintenance Trustee for Chatsworth & Marlborough Court, Pembroke Road, London W8 and we have been forwarded copies of the plans of the proposed extension to the above property.

We wish to oppose the proposed extension to the building at 29 Pembroke Road.

The flats at Marlborough Court, Pembroke Road, London W8 have balconies overlooking the proposed extension and the increase in the height and length of the existing wall to accommodate the proposed new dining room will seriously affect their light and amenity.

We would ask that this proposal be refused.

Yours faithfully

R A Baldwin
For Wood Group of Companies

Mr. R. Buxton
602-5941

16/11/99 => Derek Taylor
Area Plg. Officer: Central
Ack
JS
9/23/11/99



WOOD

GROUP OF COMPANIES

127 Mount Street
London W1Y 5HA
Telephone: 0171-647 9720.
Facsimile: 0171-647 9728.

Thackeray House, Gilbert Road,
London SE11 4NL.

Telephone: (0171) 582 0065.
Facsimile: (0171) 582 1825.

Please reply to:
Thackeray House

RECEIVED BY PLANNING SERVICES							
EX DIR	HDC	N	SW	SE	ENF	AD/ACK	
22 NOV 1999							
IO	REC	ARB	FWD PLN	CON. DES	FEEB		

① Ach

② JS

✓ g 23/11/99

50 Marlborough Court
Pembroke Road
London W8 6DF

18th November 1999

72

Your Ref: DPS/DCC/PP/99/02212/JS

M.J. French, Esq.
Executive Director, Planning and Conservation
Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea
The Town Hall
Hornton Street
London W8 7NX

Dear Sir,

Re: Proposed Development at 29 Pembroke Road, London W8 6DP

I thank you for sending notice of the referenced planning application for an extension to the dining room of the above property, to form a new room on the boundary to Marlborough Court.

While seeing no objection in principle to such an extension, I and other residents of Marlborough Court are seriously concerned about any further alteration to our common boundary wall. The wording "maintaining existing 4.2m height" is ambiguous as the actual height of the boundary wall is about half of this. We strongly object to any plan for an extension which involves its being raised.

This would also aggravate the loss of amenities already suffered by flats on the north-west corner of the block. You will recall that the previous ground floor extension utilising the boundary wall was later followed by the addition of a first floor room also extending to the boundary, so that some windows of these flats look onto a blank wall a short distance away.

The property is in the Conservation Area, the trees presumably subject to a preservation order. We are sure that the Council will be concerned with the welfare of the fine London plane. Despite assurances that preservation measures would be effective when a new house was built at the Logan Place end of the property some years ago, a mature ash unfortunately did not survive.

We trust that these points will receive your consideration.

Yours truly,
M.S. Millar
Miss M.S. Millar

RECEIVED BY PLANNING SERVICES									
EX DIR	HDC	N	Q	SW	SE	ENF	AP	ACK	
22 NOV 1999									
APPLS	IO	REC	ARB	FWD PLN	CON DES	FEES			

29 PEMBROKE ROAD — PP/99/2212

72

LETTERS OF OBJECTION.

① MR. M. L. DUNLAP, MARLBOROUGH COURT RESIDENTS ASSOC.

[19 NOV 1999]

- oppose increase in height of common boundary wall which has already been extended and raised in the past.
- Wall presents formidable expense of brickwork to residents who face it.
- further increase in expense not justified.
- should be a condition requiring retention of specific trees — evergreen winter hedge. Also condition prohibiting planting of Leylandii trees.
- concern that London Plane Tree will suffer from foundation & building works.

② MR. R. A. BLOWIN, WOOD GROUP OF COMPANIES [22 NOV 1999]
(Maintenance Trustee for Chatsworth & Marlborough Court)

- We oppose the proposed extension
- The flats at Marlborough Court have balconies overlooking the proposed extension. The increase in height and length of existing wall will seriously affect their light and amenity.

14

3

MISS. M. S. MILLAR, 50 MARLBOROUGH COURT

22 NOV 1999

→ Object to boundary wall being raised
→ This would aggravate the loss of amenities already suffered. Previous P.P.'s for an extension and then if extension involved raising the boundary wall.

→ Concern about future of London Plane Tree
(Planted at rear of garden, with access to Logan Place, resulted in death of a mature ash).

4

J.S. MASON - JOHNS (MRS), 41 MARLBOROUGH COURT

24 NOV 1999

→ Object to raising height of boundary wall - Loss of Light

→ Object to patio above proposed extension - Loss of Privacy.

FURTHER LETTERS OF OBJECTION FOLLOWING RENOTIFICATION

① MISS. M. S. MILLAR, 50 MARLBOROUGH COURT | 9 APRIL 2000

- Roof Terrace now dropped but wall would still need to be raised. Continue to object to this.
- Continue to object to proposal on basis that London Plane Tree would be harmed.

② MR. M. L. DUNLAP, MARLBOROUGH COURT RESIDENTS ASSOC

- Continue to object to any increase in height of boundary wall.
- 14 APRIL 2001

76

① Ark

② JS

19 24/11/99

41 Marlborough Court
Pembroke Road
London W8 6DF

22nd November 1999

The Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea
Planning and Conservation
The Town Hall
Hornton Street
LONDON W8 7NX.

Dear Sirs,

Proposed development at 29 Pembroke Road, London W8 6DP
Your Ref: DPS/DCC/PP/99/02212/JS

I write on behalf of my mother, the owner of 41 Marlborough Court, who is elderly and in ill health. We understand that although your letter states the above proposed development is at ground level only, a fact which was confirmed to me on the telephone by one of your staff, the plans show it is also proposed that there should be a height extension to the boundary wall and a patio above the proposed dining room.

Whereas the ground floor extension would not affect my mother's property, any building above this would definitely be both an intrusion to her privacy and possibly to her light which already suffers from a large tree in the garden of 29 Pembroke Road. There is a balcony to her flat which would suffer from any vertical development on the boundary and she would be directly overlooked into both her sitting and dining rooms.

We therefore object most strongly to any proposal for building above ground level to this proposed extension.

Yours faithfully,

Jacqueline Mason-Johns.

J.S. Mason-Johns (Mrs)

RECEIVED BY PLANNING SERVICES							
EX DIR	HDC	N	C	SW	SE	ENF	ACK
24 NOV 1999							(103)
APPEALS	IO	REC	ARB	FWD PLN	CON DES	FEEES	

Jg 5/4

60A MARLBOROUGH COURT PLANNING SERVICES
PEMBROKE ROAD,
LONDON W8 6DF
01753 714437
020 7371 4437

RECEIVED							77	
DIR	C	SW	SE	ENF	ACK			
4 APR 2007							A2A/C	
29 March 2007								
IO	REC	ARB	FWD	CON	FEES	76		
PLN	DES							

Dear Sir,

DPS/DCC/PP/99/0221/JS

Proposed development at
29 Pembroke Road

Thank you for sending me notification of amendments to the application.

We in Marlborough Court continue to be opposed to any increase in the height of the wall on our west side. This includes any work to replace any part of the wall consisting of wood/creeper with brickwork. I should much appreciate it if the Committee would bear this in mind.

when considering the Amendments.

Yours faithfully (78)

Wm Dunlop

Ad. M.L. DUNLOP.

→ P.S. Would you please address any further letters on the subject to the new chairman of the Residents' Assoc. Committee, Mrs. C. CAMPION-ATWOOD at Flat 36.

→ P.P.S. Will you please do the same in relation to the appeal concerning Lee Court in Logan Place (corner of Essex Court Road)

RECEIVED BY PLANNING SERVICES							
EX DIR	HDC	N	C	SW	SE	ENF	AO ACK
- 4 APR 2001							
APPLS	IO	REC	ARB	FWD PLN	CON DES	FEES	

188
9/14.

50 Marlborough Court
Pembroke Road
London W8 6DF

79
~~78~~

3rd April 2001

Your Ref:
DPS/DCC/PP/99/02212/JS

M.J. French Esq
Executive Director, Planning and Conservation
Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea
The Town Hall
Hornton Street
London W8 7NX

Attention Mr J. Shearman

RECEIVED BY PLANNING SERVICES									
EX DIR	HDC	N	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SW	SE	ENF	AP ACK		
- 9 APR 2001							144		
FILES	IO	REC	HL	FWD PLN	CON DES	FEE			

Dear Sir,

Re: Proposed Development at 29 Pembroke Road, London W8 6DP

Thank you for your letter of 26th March regarding the amendments to this application.

My letter of 18th November 1999 set out two main objections to the plans as they stood, and I gathered that they were of concern also to the Planning Office. Due to illness I have been unable to see the new plans but it sounds as if there is little change. The objections were:

1. The heightening of a stretch of the wall on the boundary with Marlborough Court, which would add to the loss of amenities suffered by our residents after previous extensions to the house. In addition to the rather ambiguous original drawings, I believe the Council was requesting plans to illustrate the situation from our side.

While the proposal for a roof terrace has now been dropped, it does appear that the wall would still have to be raised to accommodate the height of the dining room. If so, I and other residents of Marlborough Court would continue to have strong objections.

2. The effect on the fine London plane tree which stands in the area in question. I understand that this matter is still under consideration, and that measures to preserve the tree have been promised. Recalling that another tree in the garden of No.29 died a few years ago despite the assurance of effective preservation measures, we would be unhappy unless the new building was well clear of the tree.

We trust that these points will still receive your consideration.

Yours truly,

Miss M.S. Millar

Miss M.S. Millar