

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/1487/P	Mr & Mrs M Bury	5 Tasker Road NW2 1HT	18/05/2015 17:33:29	OBJLETTE R	Planning Application - 2015/1487/P Site Address 4 Tasker Road, London, NW3 2YR

Response to planning application from No.5 Tasker Road, connected to No. 4 Tasker Road by party wall.

These are our objections to the proposed plans as drawn. The following points are with reference to the sections of the Design and Access Statement presented May 2015.

2.2 General

“The existing front elevation is left largely unaltered by the proposals, with the original detailing restored and refurbished.”

Objection 1. We strongly object to the proposal to remove the garage door, insert 3 windows into the first floor frontage, build a first floor bedroom on the front with a balcony, as these will substantially alter the appearance of the three terraced houses designed by Walter Segal. These are Non-Designated Heritage Assets (Camden Haverstock Local List ref. 337). See below.

Address: 4, 5 and 5a Tasker Road. Significance: Architectural and Historical Significance. Asset Type: Building or Group of Buildings. Ward: Haverstock. Three terraced houses by architect Walter Segal, a pioneer environmental architect. Dating to 1963 they are compact timber and brick houses with glazed terraces overlooking garden; innovative use of natural light; exemplar for the ‘Segal method’ of timber framed construction. These were the last masonry houses designed by Segal and a prototype for his innovative self build homes.

2 Design Proposal

“The proposal involves extensions to ground and first floor of the existing house. These small extensions, outlined below, will increase its amenity as a single-family dwelling allowing better use of internal space and improving the aesthetic quality of the building. “

Objection 2. It seems clear from the plan, and the designation of 4A, that the aim is to transform it from a single family dwelling to multiple occupation with two separate flats, increasing the volume by 110m³ (over one third of the existing), with two separate entrances at 4 and 4A.

Multiple occupancy with three toilets would create potential load on the existing sewage system which runs downhill under the site of St Dominic’s Priory, given that the previous 1992 kitchen extension to No 4 built over the access manhole, it is likely to become very difficult to clear a blocked sewer pipe should this occur, which would affect the entire row of houses.

2.1 Ground floor

“The proposal involves a rearward extension at ground floor level facing South. The increased internal space will be reconfigured to provide an open-plan living and dining space affording plenty of light into the ground floor.”

Objection 3. As parties directly affected by the proposed back extension, we request disclosure as to

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>building methods so that it may be decided whether the services of a party wall surveyor will need to be engaged, before any final decision is reached.</p> <p>Objection 4. The proposed rear roof garden will allow significant overlooking of, and loss of privacy to, the two rear facing bedrooms of No. 5 and No. 5A, as well as overlooking the rear conservatory of No. 5.</p> <p>“The existing utility/store room at ground floor level will be converted into a TV room.”</p> <p>Objection 5. The removal of designated off street parking (garage) and conversion to plant room and TV room, would, along with possible multiple occupancy, put further pressure on street parking, with cars potentially parked across garage access.</p> <p>2.2 First floor</p> <p>“A North-facing glass extension will increase habitable space at first floor level whilst maintaining the view of the church from the road.”</p> <p>Objection 6. It is not certain that the foundations used to build the previous 1992 kitchen extension to No 4 would be able to carry the extra weight of the front bedroom proposed over the existing kitchen extension. This could potentially cause detrimental movement in the foundations to No. 5 and 5A. The drawing 10713 from the proposed extension in Mar 1999 (App. No. PE9900053) shows no additional foundations to the kitchen extension of 1992 apart from the strip foundations built by Walter Segal.</p> <p>1.3</p> <p>“ Access arrangements are unchanged by this proposal and there are no alterations that impact the entrances or the approach to the house.”</p> <p>Comment. The hazard to parents taking their children to St. Dominic’s Primary School will need to be considered, as builders’ lorries will only be able to access the site via the cul-de-sac end of Tasker Road. There may be an additional risk as lorries attempt to reverse while small children are being taken to school and nursery.</p> <p>See also comment under Objection 2 above.</p>
