

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2025/0051/P	Harvey Flinder	26/01/2025 13:26:41	OBJ	<p>Application No 2025/0051/P 3, Lawford Road, NW5 2LH</p> <p>Objection to the above.</p> <p>The application cites precedent as the over-riding reason for approval. This assumes that the permission granted for the precedents was correct and that planning guidelines have remained unchanged. I don't believe this to be the case.</p> <p>If today, I sought approval for a two storey rear extension to a house in Lawford Rd, an extension that increased the total volume of the building by more than 25% I would expect the application to be refused. In the case of 13 Lawford Road it was permitted.</p> <p>If I sought approval for a first floor rear extension with large patio doors and a roof terrace overlooking my neighbours property I would expect it to be refused. In the case of 3 Lawford Road it was permitted. It overlooks the rear of 1 Lawford Road and Nos 11, 13 & 15 Bartholomew Villas.</p> <p>The above application, 3 Lawford Road, seeks approval for an extension on top of the existing extension which should never have been approved in the first place.</p> <p>I write as the owner of a property in the same conservation area and I too built an extension on the rear of my house. It was carefully designed to be within the existing building line, to be ground floor only and not to overlook any neighbouring property.</p> <p>I expect the Planning Dept to be not only considerate of residents' privacy but consistent in its decisions. As residents we look to the Planning Dept to help protect the integrity of the Conservation Area (Bartholomew Estate). These large, two storey extensions alter and disfigure the architecture of the Conservation Area and are insensitive and ugly additions.</p> <p>To cite an error in judgement as a precedent only compounds the original erroneous decision.</p>
