

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3002/L	Chris & Helen Harrison	26 Grove Terrace London NW5 1PL	25/06/2015 09:31:10	OBJ	<p>We object to the application. We repeat the comments that we have made on the related application 2015/2658/P. We live next door to the applicant property, at 26 Grove Terrace. The houses are terraced: we would therefore be very directly affected by any works at the applicant property.</p> <p>Our objections are on 4 grounds.</p> <p>First, we are extremely concerned at the amount of digging out that is proposed at the lower ground floor level. The plans that have been submitted do not adequately explain what is intended, particularly as there is no section which shows the depth of the digging out and the application has not included a construction management plan. These are old and very shaky houses, dating from the late eighteenth century. They have no real foundations. The degree of digging out that is proposed could cause real structural problems of very major concern. We are concerned not only about the depth of the digging but also about the width – the application is to dig out right up to the boundary with our property. We are therefore very worried about the possibility of our home being seriously damaged.</p> <p>Second, we are concerned that the proposed ground floor extension is too bulky. It would extend further from the rear wall of the property than the ground floor kitchen at our home. Our kitchen extends by approximately 3.6m, so the proposed 4m at the applicant property would be out of line with this. We are concerned too about the height of the proposed ground floor extension. It would extend above the garden wall between the two properties, changing the view we have to that side.</p> <p>Third, we are concerned about light pollution. The proposed panel in the roof of the extension would cause light to shine upwards across the rear of our property. The proposed large glass doors at the rear would allow considerably more light to escape across the rear of our property than the doors that are there at present.</p> <p>Fourth, we consider that the proposed materials are out of keeping with these properties. The use of metal frames and such a large area of glass on the proposed rear doors would sit very uneasily with the existing style and materials. The traditional style and materials are wood, with glazed doors with glazing bars.</p> <p>We should highlight that the property is listed Grade II*. We do feel that it is essential to protect and preserve its character, as well as protecting our own property (also listed Grade II*) from structural damage.</p>