

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3100/P	Mr Richard Dweck	Flat 2 89 Priory Road London NW6 3NL	12/07/2015 14:33:27	OBJ	<p>Incorrect details on application form:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is an incorrect statement on the application form. The building was a single large Victorian home, which was later, converted in to 6 flats and not purpose built as stated in the application. The applicants have not yet been granted freehold permission to build; they have permission in principle for an extension but do not have permission to build the plans submitted to the council from the Freehold. The proposed extension exceeds the horizontal building line considerably again the application form incorrectly states it doesn't. The extension is not a single storey the plans are for a double storey extension as two rooms one on top of the other are being proposed. They are digging down by 1m and are going up beyond the existing first floor flat's floor level. We believe a basement impact report should be submitted. <p>Size of extension:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I understand a planning member has viewed this application at pre-application stage has advised the extension should be reduced significantly. In our view this has not been done. The original proposal was 7m in size it is still 7m in size including the fenced terrace which in its present design is as obtrusive as having a solid structure in terms of light and physical obtrusion. The height of the extension 5.4m. 4.4 m above ground level plus 1 m subterranean also means considerable obtrusion of light as if a separate dwelling house like structure has been erected on to the existing private garden. This is not what was intended when the freehold included the patio as part of flat 1 lease. Flat 2 is a ground floor and basement flat and will be at great risk from any potential damage caused during the building process if a 1 meter subterranean dig takes place. Increase risk of flood and structural damage are all real risks to the dwelling. The proposed extension, building at 5.5 m and fenced garden exceeds the horizontal building line considerably. Neighbouring properties do not have any extensions of this size. <p>Impact on Garden:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The fenced terrace section creates a division of the garden. We don't believe the height at 2m and material of the fence is in keeping with the style and period of the building and the rest of the garden. In erecting the considerable fenced area it damages the appearance of the communal garden. It looks like there is a separate individual home within the garden. We believe when the free hold granted the lease of the patio to Flat 1 it was not with the intention of building an extension and sectioned off garden but that the occupants might have sole use of that section of garden. The extension would require a tree to be felled and we are in a conservation area where preserving a trees life should come before any development. Also the removal of a tree's root system places the structural stability of neighbouring buildings under threat. We understand from the second arborist report that the tree could be pruned to prevent spreading of the disease and importantly keep the tree alive. The size of the extension overshadows the rest of the garden spoiling the enjoyment for the rest of the occupants. <p>Materials:</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

- A Zinc Roof is not in keeping with a period building, which has a tiled roof. This is a modern building material, which looks out of place on a Victorian property.
- The floor to ceiling aluminum-framed windows is not in keeping with a Victorian building, or any of the neighbouring buildings facades. The excessive use of glass means the view from the users of the communal garden will be overlooked and more importantly the occupants of flat 1 can be viewed from the garden. As this is being used as a bedroom space as opposed to a living area we find this unacceptable.

Light:

- Flat 2 89 Priory road is also on the ground floor and receives the majority its natural light via the garden exposure. The proposed extension horizontally and vertically will greatly reduce this light.
- The garden outlook the rest of the flats of 89 Priory Road currently enjoy will be replaced by a view of a considerable modern out of keeping structure.

Stability of existing structure:

- Priory road is notoriously prone to subsidence. 89 Priory Road has had subsidence in the past and has meant that the building as a consequence has had to obtain specialist buildings insurance to cover the building. If this project is approved there is a risk this cover will no longer be valid. We are concerned that the removal of a tree and digging down would affect the building's stability and increase the risk of flooding.

To conclude:

- This extension is not just placing the buildings structural integrity in to questions but is also damaging the charming Victorian façade, a major reason why residents are drawn to the south Hampstead conservation area.
 - 89 Priory Road used to be a single home dwelling and has had its internal area changed to incorporate 6 flats. Its external view has in this time remained largely unchanged and still has the appearance of a Victorian dwelling. The extension proposal will create a mish mash of design and material and ruin this charming Victorian look.
 - The applicants with their proposal are trying to create a separate dwelling / house feel with private fenced garden. This is not the intention of the freehold when it granted permission.
-