

Dear Sir/Madam, I am writing for the second time as I can't see that my comments have been recorded. I am very concerned that the proposed work will significantly reduce the morning light to the gardens that back onto the properties in question, which includes my own. This will affect the finely balanced ecosystem of all the green triangle that benefits all the local residents even those that do not have a garden. There will also be a reduction of light to the properties too. My wife and I therefore strongly object to the proposed building work. Yours sincerely, Robert Cowan and Tracy Ann Oberman

2013/6125/P

11/11/2013 09:50:23

OBJ

Further to my husband's objection to the development, which was lodged on 8 October 2013, I wish to add my personal comments as to the manner in which the plans for developing 21 - 23 Cressy Road have been handled. It is my belief that the planning application 2013/2882/P, approved 12 June 2013, was disingenuous in the way that it presented the loft space room accommodation and the statistics concerning previous use of accommodation. The previous owner was never able to let out all the rooms claimed by the applicant, other than for the very briefest of periods. I have no reason to disbelieve that the m² calculation of the total loft area is valid but to omit to mention that the uninhabitable eave space is included makes nonsense of the planning process and brings it into disrepute. Thus there was a certain inevitability that the applicant would return with another proposal (this one) to raise the roof in order to add the required height to make the eave space habitable. In my opinion this piece meal approach to gaining planning consent should be resisted. I would urge the Council to withdraw its earlier planning consent because the information concerning acceptable living space height was knowingly withheld at the time of the first application.

2013/6125/P

30/10/2013 16:44:32

OBJ

I am writing in response to your letter dated October 18th, re the planning application for the works at 21-23 Cressy Road, London NW3 2NB. My wife and I live at an [REDACTED] E. Our garden backs onto the rear extension of 21-23 Cressy Rd We are worried that the proposed roof extension will block the sunlight coming into our garden and to those of our neighbours. This will have a significant effect on the ecosystem of the gardens in question, [REDACTED] has striven to protect in the past. The gardens are in important space and actually benefit everyone that borders them, even if they do not have a garden themselves. If the height of 21-23 Cressy Rd is raised through the proposed extension it will reduce morning sunlight to ours and the adjacent gardens, and also have a significant effect on the ecosystem. Some gardens will actually receive no light at all and therefore will become barren. This is why the building in question was built lower than the adjacent houses as the builders were aware of the effect it would have on the gardens of the houses that back onto it. There will also be less light in the houses too. This is why we object to this planning application. Yours sincerely, Robert Cowan and Tracy Ann Oberman

Application No:
2013/6125/P

Received:
08/11/2013 09:34:15

Comment:
OBJ

Response:
Re the proposed changes to 21-23 Cressy Road London NW3 2NB:

The current East Front is in my opinion a very attractive addition to the street. It adds to the visual interest of that corner. The proposed front, although it appears to fit in with the rest of the terrace, removes the variety which is one of the important features of the street and of the conservation area in general.

The proposed changes do not appear to bring any benefits to the neighbourhood. I live at the bottom of Cressy Road so will not be directly affected by the loss of light to the gardens, but it seems obvious that the immediate neighbours will be adversely affected.

Above all this is a conservation area, and maintaining it is a precious duty which I hope the council will uphold.

2013/6125/P

07/11/2013 08:48:39

OBJ

[REDACTED] which is opposite the proposed development. Contrary to what is stated in the planning application, NON uniformity of roofline is an essential part of Cressy Road's and the neighbourhood's charm. If all our roofs were the same, the area would look like a characterless modern development.

I object to an application that removes diversity from our urban landscape.

2013/6125/P

02/11/2013 13:27:29

OBJ

I have read through this planning application and object strongly.
1. Whilst I accept the internals and some externals need renovation the assertions that this property was vacant and empty is untrue. This was inhabited until the death of the owner in 2012.
2. This is an area of diverse housing. The present frontage and height of the building are typical of many in the area, for example in Constantine Road, and it is a rare example of a double-fronted house. The facade should remain as is. The pictures submitted on the application only show rows of houses like the one they want to build and not the diversity.
3. The original application which was approved called for residential minor alterations; this second application calls for major renovations which are not in keeping with the conservation area. You will note that there was little if any objections to the original application which was approved because we realise these renovations were necessary to provide decent housing.
4. This road is unique as we have very little movement of families. We are not nimby and accept change however this developer is not taking into account the neighbouring properties nor does he care about the look and feel of our conservation area.

I strongly object to the new application to raise the roof of 21-23 Cressy Road.

The Council is requested to reject the planning application as being inappropriate for the Conservation area because it will spoil the open aspect of a number of houses in Constantine Road, which back onto the proposed development. This also applies to a number of neighbouring houses in Cressy Road whose occupants value the natural space, light and existing geometry of the roofline.

Reasons for Objection

I wish to object on the following grounds

1. Raising the roofline represents a fundamental change to the aspect and appearance of the Victorian terraced houses in the road.
2. It will reduce the visual impact of the existing side and overhead space that is enjoyed by all the properties that look out onto the existing property.
3. It runs contrary to the intentions set out in the Mansfield conservation area appraisal and management strategy adopted on 4 December 2008. Page 28 of this document refers to roof alterations and extensions and says

“The conservation area retains its clearly visible historic rooflines, which it is important to preserve. Fundamental changes to the roofline, etc can harm the historic character of the roofscape and will be resisted.”

4. Cressy Road has been unspoilt with the development of front dormers and the preservation of the original roofscape is an equally important consideration.
5. Cressy Road with its mix of front window styles and the inclusion of a double fronted house with a lower roofline and adjoining open space serves a fine example of the varied and considered approach to house design by the Victorians.
6. 21 - 23 Cressy Road is a particularly narrow site and the original specification to build a double fronted house in the road to compensate for the awkwardness of the site should be materially respected and maintained.
7. The two-storey height limitation prevents it from being ungainly and intrusive to the neighbouring houses in Constantine Road that look directly onto it.

