

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/2469/P	Edward Williams RIBA	57 princess road regents park NW1 8JS NW1 8JS	21/05/2015 11:15:57	OBJ	<p>I wish to object to this application for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Changing the window designs are not in keeping with the general fenestration patterns in the street and infilling the deleted windows will leave a visually unacceptable brick wall. 2. Increasing the height of the extension by deleting the railings is unacceptable as the new height would be oppressive. 3. The two storey height glazing to the existing facade is unacceptable as the pattern of general fenestration in the street would be compromised. It also would result in increased overlooking for the neighbours. 4. The proposed single storey extension is completely unacceptable. The Council permitted such an extension to number 18 Edis Street in the 1960"s and soon discovered their mistake. No other extension of this type has been allowed since. <p>The proposed elevations and sections show a difference of approx 500mm between the garden levels of 18 Edis St and 57 plus 59 in Princess Road. This is NOT correct. The levels of the gardens are approx equal and are at the same level as the finish floor level of the basements in No 17 and the neighbouring properties.</p> <p>The effect of this error is to lower the roof line of the proposed extension by 500mm. I would ask that the case officer take a view on the reasons why this has been done.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Drawing PL-110 is also incorrect. The garden walls do not align, as shown, with the gardens of princess Road. There is an offset of approx half a meter to the north. This means that my garden wall shares 500mm with the garden wall of 17 Edis St. Again I would ask the case officer to take a view as to why such a simple mistake has been made. <p>In summary this is an ill conceived application and I would appear that the applicant has not bothered to discuss these proposals with the planners prior to making an application. Architecturally it is a mish mash of conflicting elements. There is also no mention of the demolition work required in order to construct this extension.</p>