

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/2042/P	ann pennington	6 gloucester crescent nw1 7ds	27/05/2015 13:29:21	OBJ	<p>I have lived in Gloucester Crescent for many years. I chose to live here because of the gracious quality of the Crescent; its wide fronted houses and their green and leafy setting.</p> <p>I find the application for no 5 difficult to understand but it appears that some of the proposals seek to work against this character.</p> <p>Although the Heritage Statement appears thorough, the content of the proposals does not match this. As I understand it, the application is for the following :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Erection of single storey rear extension to lower ground floor level with new external staircase to ground level to create roof terrace with glazed balustrade - Erection of single storey garden room - Installation of 1 no rooflight over top floor internal stairwell and replacement windows to rear - Internal alterations including removal of partition walls to reconfigure internal layout of lower ground floors and part lowering of 2nd floor to accommodate shower room <p>The drawings and documents are contradictory and do not show how the building relates to its neighbours :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Lower Ground Rear Garden Plan does not show the proposed spiral stair - The Elevations show a glass balustrade to what is described in the Application as a roof terrace whereas the Appearance and Materials section of the Application describes the spiral stair as being proposed for access for maintenance. - The removal of the spine wall at first floor level is shown on the drawings but not mentioned in the Application description. - In addition, the Elevation shows the ground level of no 5 and my property to be level but I think my property is lower by approximately 0.5m. This means that the proposed extension and garden room have considerably more impact on me. <p>I also think that the use of a photograph that shows a part width extension is misleading when the extension proposed is full width.</p> <p>Overall, I think that the works proposed do not reflect the fact that the house is Grade 2 listed and do not respect my privacy and amenity.</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

The size of the garden room is excessive and no mention is made of the roof coverings proposed or the use of the room

The full width extension is inconsiderate and appears unnecessary. Further, the roof terrace, spiral stair and glass balustrade also appear unnecessary when there is no means of access from the raised ground floor.

The proposed use of stucco as a facing material for the extension is also out of character in this area.

I ask that you reject this application on the basis that it does not respect the character of these listed buildings and would be detrimental to the area.
