

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4659/P	Jennifer Otway-Norwood	45 Ravenshaw Street London NW6 1NP	04/09/2014 20:18:52	OBJ	<p>I am writing to object to the latest planning application on 41 Ravenshaw Street. Planning permission was granted on this property on 10 April 2013 for the erection of a single storey extension at ground floor level to a single dwelling house.</p> <p>This is a retrospective application because the owner has carried out works to the building which do not comply with the planning permission granted in April 2013.</p> <p>The single storey glazed roof extension (for which permission was granted) was to have been between the wall of the rear return and the wall of the adjoining house. The existing pitched roof of the rear return was to have been retained.</p> <p>The works actually carried out have resulted in the glazed roof being dispensed with and an asphalt flat roof has been installed in its' place. The rear return to the house has been raised by a height of 5 breeze blocks totalling 1.075m in height or 15 brick courses. The original pitched roof has therefore been replaced by a flat roof. The net effect of these unsanctioned alterations has been a loss of light and amenity in the neighbouring property and a significant diminution in the character of a Victorian building.</p> <p>If planning permission had been sought in the proper fashion (i.e. before the works were carried out) for these alterations the occupier at No 39 could have objected and the Council could have considered the matter. Instead we have a situation where the owner has sought permission for one scheme and has built another; an inference can be drawn that possibly the owner was hoping that as the work has been carried out it would be more difficult for the Council to refuse to grant retrospective permission. This is a blatant disregard for the Council's original and considered decision as well as the neighbour's right to object.</p> <p>The Council's planning policy guidance notes requires that any development takes account of sunlight, daylight, outlook, overshadowing and DP26 requires that all development takes account of the impact on the occupiers and neighbours. None of this has been regarded in the works carried out.</p> <p>In any build there are small issues that may not exactly comply with planning permissions granted but I do not think that this applies in this case as the finishes are generally of poor quality and the overall design does not consider the impact on the neighbouring property at all. DP24(a) has been completely ignored.</p> <p>I urge the Council not to grant retrospective permission for a development which has a significant impact on the neighbouring property in terms of loss of amenity, and a significant diminution in daylight and sunlight. Given this, and the fact that it is being presented as a "fait accompli" I hope the Council upholds its original decision and does not give retrospective permission.</p>