Application No: Site Address: Case Officer: Consultees Name: Printed on: 08/05/2013 09:05:04

Application No: Site Address: Case Officer: Consultees Name: Received: Comment:

2013/1559/P 41 Ravenshaw Street Sam Fowler Ms Jennifer Otway-Norwood 30/04/2013 19:02:09 OBJ

London NW6 1NP

Response:

I object to the proposed extension on the rear return of No 41 Ravenshaw Street. A previous application for a similar extension has already been refused by the council and I ask that you similarly refuse this application. My reasons are:

- 1. The extension adds an extra storey on the rear addition and this will impact adversely on the terrace of fine Victorian buildings as it will be the first of its kind in the street. It will create a dangerous and unwelcome precedent.
- 2. The bulk of the proposed extension will loom over the neighbouring gardens including my own. The street is on a hill and this property is slightly higher up the hill and the effect of the bulk will be magnified.
- 3. The height of the proposed extension will be higher than the chimney stack on the rear addition and it will be visually unattractive.
- 4. The symmetry of the sloping roofs on each rear addition in the terrace will be disturbed.
- 5. The house is already large enough for a family to live in without increasing the size by extending over the rear addition. The original application was to convert the property into two flats including such a rear extension and the revised plans, as drawn, show that the property could be so converted without recourse to planning if this application is approved.
- 6. I think this is a means of trying to obtain permission for the original application by stealthy means and as it sets a very unwelcome precedent for the terrace I ask that it be refused.
- 7. There are not very many Victorian houses in this part of Camden as many have been converted to flats. To allow the extension on the rear addition is to destroy a house which is part of our heritage for no good reason.

I ask that you refuse this application

Thank you

Jennie Norwood, 45 Ravenshaw Street

Printed on: 08/05/2013 09:05:04

Application No: Site Address: Case Officer: Consultees Name: Received: Comment:

2013/1559/P 41 Ravenshaw Street Sam Fowler Mrs Anne Mollen 27/04/2013 16:38:58 OBJ

London NW6 1NP

Response:

As the owner of 43 Ravenshaw Street, I wish to express my objections to the proposed application. It is troubling to be required to comment on a revised proposal that, in significant respects, suffers from the same faults as the application previously rejected.

The proposed extension is entirely out of scale with the lot, the terrace and the neighborhood. It will have a significantly deleterious effect on light and privacy on the back of the house and garden at 43 Ravenshaw Street and will tower over both.

We believe that the proposed extension also increases the risk of subsidence in a terrace built on clay, and without cellars, in an area that has already experienced issues of this type.

We further understand that the drawings do not show that 43 Ravenshaw Street has a shared chimney stack with no. 41, and the extension would require an extension to the existing chimney stack at 43 Ravenshaw in order to comply with applicable building regulations. We believe those changes would have a negative effect on the appearance of our house.

Application No: Site Address: Case Officer: Consultees Name: Received: Comment:

2013/1559/P 41 Ravenshaw Street Sam Fowler Ms Danielle Blanchard 01/05/2013 22:39:44 OBJ

London NW6 1NP

Response:

We object to the proposed rearwards dormer extension above the original rear addition to the house.

- 1. The extension does not respect the original Victorian architecture of the terrace due to its bulk and form. Its large bulk and flat roof would visually interrupt the preserved characteristic rhythm and symmetry of the sloping roofs and height of the rear additions within this terrace.
- 2. The proposed drawings have carelessly omitted the shared chimney stack on the party parapet wall with No.43 Ravenshaw Street. The construction of a 3rd storey would require it to be built up against and above the height of the existing shared chimney. This would be visually discordant and result in the loss of a key characteristic of the terrace. Moreover it would require the raising of the chimney to No. 43 so to comply with Building Regulations and would look completely incongruous.
- 3. The proposed rectangular window to the rear elevation does not respect the window proportions of the house and also undersized for the wall surface area giving the "design".a very heavy appearance.
- 4. There are no rearwards extensions to rear dormers in this terrace. The size of the properties are already sufficient to meet present and future needs either as single homes or as 2 separate flats. Granting this application would set a dangerous and unnecessary precedent for the street. The proposed enlargement at 2nd floor (roof) level is for the use as a study; the proposed plan arrangement of the house suggests an intention to create a separate dwelling within the property.
- 5. The application states the roof will have "matched slate tiling." This contradicts what is shown on the proposed elevation drawing which shows the extension to be enclosed with mismatched vertically coursed cladding.

The proposed additional storey to the rear addition is a poorly considered proposal which pays no respect to the historic host building due to its size, shape and form.