Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Printed on: 02/07/2015 09:05:19 <b>Response:</b>
2015/2534/P	Kenneth Robbie	Flat 4 43 Lancaster Grove London NW3 4HB	29/06/2015 16:26:1	3 ОВЈ	I object to the proposed development. In my view the dimensions of the proposed structure are excessive in relation to the house and the garden; and the mass and character of the building would not be in keeping with the Conservation Area. I fully support the comments lodged by Barrie Tankel of 43A Lancaster Grove.
2015/2534/P	David Gluckman	12 Lancaster Drive Garden Flat NW3 4HA	29/06/2015 19:26:1	7 COMMEMP ER	I am writing in support of Barrie Tankell's objections to the proposed new extension at 45A Lancaster Grove. Having been engaged in the objections to the previous extension at that address, it was my understanding that the occupants of 45A were required to demolish their extension, both the above-ground structure and the basement and return it to its original state. Looking from my garden, the extension is still there, as unsightly as ever. Why is the council entertaining a new application when the previous order has been completely ignored?
					The new extension is still too large. The changes to the design are neither 'marginal' nor 'conservative' as the proposals suggest. They impose and intrude on adjacent properties, especially Mr Tankell's, and they steal light from his garden and living room windows.
					The suggestion that the basement excavation has had no impact of the local water table seems without foundation. Our garden was waterlogged last winter and yet no visit was made to inspect the situation and determine if it has been caused by the excavations at 45A.
					This is a continuing waste of the council's valuable time. Surely there are more important issues in our community than to endlessly debate a scheme that is patently in no one's interest save the owners of 45A Lancaster Grove. We should not allow this development to proceed.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Printed on: 02/07/2015 09:05:19 <b>Response:</b>
2015/2534/P	Barbara Bryant	Garden Flat 12 lancaster Drive London NW3 4HA	29/06/2015 19:15:29	OBJ	I am writing in support of my neighbour Mr Barrie Tankel at 47 Lancaster Grove in his objection to the now proposed scheme at No. 45. Flat A  In the Design and Access Statement, G. Detailed description, the now proposed extension is variously referred to as being 3.7 and 3.8 m in height. Which is it?  Comparing widths of the original extension to that now proposed, 4.9m and 6m, the increase is described as "conservative" and that it "marginally exceeds" the original. In my view a 22% increase is neither conservative nor marginal but a dishonest attempt to present a new scheme in a favourable light. The bay window, made much of, will not have any space to its left.  Overall the proposed new build it too big, too bulky and has a massive ugly roof to be overlooked by dozens of people.  Concerning the effect on the local water table the 2012 report stated that the proposed extension and new basement could create an additional barrier to potential groundwater flow. Yet the more recent hydrology report presumably commissioned by Mr Silver, comments that the basement excavation is highly unlikely to cause adverse changes to the local hydrogeology. Well it has done so! In my previous objections to this development I stated that the water table in my garden at 12 Lancastrer Drive has changed since it took place. This last winter, which was not particularly wet, saw standing water on my lawn nearest to 47. No-one has been to see the impact of the development on my garden nor was access ever requested.  The gardens and lovely trees in this area are an important green space and should be treasured, not built over at will  In principle I feel it is dangerous to have a situation where extensions can be built illegally and then granted retrospective permission.  I urge you to reject this now proposed scheme.
2015/2534/P	Genie Lee	16 Lancaster Grove	29/06/2015 21:57:40	PETITNOBJ E	Inapropriate size and structure. Out of character with its surroundings
2015/2534/P	Simon Wingfield	51 Lancaster Grove	30/06/2015 14:01:20	OBJ	I am concerned about the precedent that is set if retrospective approval is granted for planning permission, which should only be permitted in exceptional circumstances. I also share some of the concerns raised in other comments, in particular the impact of an extension of the proposed scale on neighbouring light and the precedent set by allowing such a bulky building to be added at the rear
2015/2534/P	Diana Self	Flat 3 37 Lancaster Grove Belsize Park NW3 4HB	29/06/2015 17:22:05	INT	I wish to object to the development proposed in this application. Given its relationship to neighboring residential buildings, the proposed structure is In my view too wide, too long and too high. The granting of planning permission for this development would establish a most unfortunate precedent for extensions into neighboring gardens.  For more detailed and informed comments I would refer you to the objections raised by Barrie Tankel FRICS which I support.