

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3564/P	Antonietta Franchi	1 Parsifal Road London nw61ug	01/08/2015 11:14:13	OBJ	<p>I would like to object to the planning application 2015/3564/P for the erection of a single storey roof extension with various alterations, because these alterations would be contrary to council policies and guidelines as contained in the draft unitary development plans and special planning guidance by virtue of size, and bulk and they would therefore be detrimental to the appearance of the building and the visual amenity of the surrounding area. I also object to the windows on the west facing elevation (application form d-NA 15PRR 02 203 Ele Prop SW) which will infringe on my privacy. A similar application for this very same property and the adjoining house 1E was previously refused and the same reasons apply here now, see application pw9802404r1 (but note location map shown is incorrect) . It is very clear from the first original buildings application number f4/5/b/25466 (but again note location map shown is incorrect) how much larger the proposed extensions would result. This property has already been substantially developed in 2008, planning numbers (2008/2271/p) and (2008/2273/p) and a further extension would result in excessive size and bulk and thus not subordinate . This application should be refused because the scale and proportions of the building would be overwhelmed by additional extension as per the councils cpg 1 guidelines. Also part of the proposed extension is over a previous extension which is over what was previously a garage . This application is solely for 1f, whereas the proposed drawings submitted are misleading as they do not show the extension next to the adjoining property in its current state. The drawings show two separate proposals in situ.</p> <p>In this location there is no established form of roof addition or alteration to a terrace or group of similar buildings and this proposal would separate it from the existing group of buildings and townscape.</p>

2015/3564/P	Antonietta Franchi	1 Parsifal london nw61ug	31/07/2015 10:12:01	OBJ	<p>I would like to object to the planning application 2015/3564/P for the erection of a single storey roof extension with various alterations, because these alterations would be contrary to council policies and guidelines as contained in the draft unitary development plans and special planning guidance by virtue of size, and bulk and they would therefore be detrimental to the appearance of the building and the visual amenity of the surrounding area. I also object to the windows on the west facing elevation (application form d-NA 15PRR 02 203 Ele Prop SW) which will infringe on my privacy. A similar application for this very same property and the adjoining house 1e was previously refused and the same reasons apply here now, see application pw9802404r1 (but note location map shown is incorrect) . It is very clear from the first original buildings application number f4/5/b/25466 (but again note location map shown is incorrect) how much larger the proposed extensions would result. This property has already been substantially developed in 2008, planning numbers (2008/2271/p) and (2008/2273/p) and a further extension would result in excessive size and bulk and thus not subordinate . This application should be refused because the scale, visual prominence and proportions of the building would be overwhelmed by additional extension as per the councils cpg 1 guidelines. Also part of the proposed extension is over a previous extension which is over what was previously a garage . This application is solely for 1f, whereas the proposed drawings submitted are misleading as they do not show the extension next to the adjoining property 1e in its current state. The drawings show two separate proposals in situ.</p> <p>In this location there is no established form of roof addition or alteration to a terrace or group of similar buildings and this proposal would separate it from the existing group of buildings and townscape.</p>
-------------	--------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------	-----	---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3564/P	Alexander Sebba	35 Lyncroft Gardens	02/08/2015 22:08:25	COMMNT	

Dear Mr Gracie

I have set out below the background and basis on which I am objecting to the planning application 2015/3564/P made by 1F Parsifal Road.

The Original Application (f4/5/25466)

The two houses, 1F and 1G, were originally built as small family houses with garages. 1F was initially designed as a three bedroom house but was in fact utilised as a two bedroom house. Subsequently, the garages of 1F and 1G were converted into living spaces and the houses were extended. Today, the original houses, and in particular 1F, would not be granted planning to be built considering the close proximity to 33,35 & 37 Lyncroft Gardens. In the current applications, 1F and 1G are applying to extend the houses to include six/seven bedrooms.

From the case application, f4/5/25466, which granted planning to build 1F and 1G at the rear of 525 Finchley Road, it can be seen that great care was taken to reduce the impact of the houses on Lyncroft Gardens and the surrounding area. 1F was supposed to be sunk roughly 1.2m from the garden level of 1F and the garage of 1F was supposed to be set back from Lyncroft Gardens and on a different level altogether to allow for parking. The back of the garage was supposed to be lowered to the same level as the house and was designed to be used as a utility room. The consideration that was given to impact and bulk in relation to 33 and 35 Lyncroft Gardens can be seen on the planning drawing where the elevation of the house is drawn with someone standing in the gardens of 33 or 35 Lyncroft Gardens. If a person stands today in the gardens of 33 and 35 Lyncroft Gardens in the same position as drawn in the original application, it is clear that 1F was never built in accordance with the planning application. 1F clearly breached the planning by not sinking the house at all. The house, the garage and the garden were in fact all built on one level. It could be argued that the house has been sunk as there are three steps going down to the entrance level of the house. However, that is the nature of the topography and the fact remains that 1F was supposed to be lower than the current garden of the house to reduce the overall bulk. It is not.

The 2008 Extension

In 2008, a first floor infill extension to 1F was constructed and received planning despite there being no consultation. This had a significant impact on both 33 and 35 Lyncroft Gardens in terms of right of light, bulk, amenity and outlook. In respect of the latter, both 33 and 35 Lyncroft Gardens had to grow and increase the height of their gardens to try and hide the extension as best as possible. Furthermore, 1F did not comply with the approved planning in that the remainder of the first floor was not clad. The purpose of the cladding was to provide continuity with the extension. The side window on the extension was also meant to be built at angle of 90 degrees to 35 Lyncroft Gardens. It wasn't. This requirement was to prevent 1F looking directly into 35 Lyncroft Gardens. The workmanship was also of a poor

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

quality in relation to the brick work. Finally, when the extension was built, 1F inserted new windows into the wall facing 35 Lyncroft Gardens. It took me 4 years to ensure that the new windows were frosted and as such were in accordance with planning enforcement. To now grant permission to 1F to build a third floor would result in a real eyesore especially when no provisions are in place to safeguard against poor workmanship.

1F was originally built with the first floor being subordinate to the host building in terms of height, depth and length. The purpose of this design was no doubt to reduce the impact and bulk on 33 and 35 Lyncroft Gardens. The 2008 first floor extension to 1F has already made a significant impact by extending straight to the perimeter of the host building in both directions. To now add an additional level to 1F, as per the current application, will have a material effect on 33 Lyncroft Gardens and especially on 35 Lyncroft Gardens. It will create a further sense of being enclosed and overshadowed which will be detrimental to our amenities. The additional floor to 1F will add bulk which will affect the outlook from the rear rooms of 35 Lyncroft Gardens and will also affect the light entering into the property.

Camden Development Policy and the UDP, CPG and CDP

I would like to draw your attention to CDP (Camden Development Policy) paragraph 24.23 which clearly states that the residential amenity of neighbours must be preserved, see below.
 “However, the densely built up nature of the borough means that the provision of private amenity space can be challenging, and the Council will require that the residential amenity of neighbours be preserved, in accordance with policy DP26 – Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours and Core Strategy policy CS5 – Managing the impact of growth and development.”

In this context, I object to the development in terms of bulk, context with the surrounding area, design, right of light, amenity, outlook and enclosure of the garden. Approval of the current application would also set a precedent for no. 1 Parsifal Road to build a 3 storey house or a 4 storey house (with basement) which would further affect 35 Lyncroft Gardens in terms of outlook, natural light and enclosure of the garden area. This development would be detrimental to the visual amenity and to the surrounding area.

In 1998 an application by houses 1E & 1F for a mansard roof extension was refused (application No PW9802404R1). A mansard roof would be more desirable than what is being proposed in the current application as it sits back from the external wall and has a sloping slate roof. This application was refused on the basis that the houses 1E and 1F were not suitable to have an additional floor. At the time, the 1998 application contradicted the UDP and the SPG. The current application contradicts the UDP, CPG (replacement of the SPG) and CDP.

In conclusion, given that 1F previously breached the approved planning applications and given that the building is simply unsuitable for further development, I would request to put an article 4 in place on 1F. A major concern is that future planning applications (like the application in 2008) will be passed without proper consultation and as such would deny my neighbours and myself our rights.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
-----------------	------------------	------------------	-----------	----------	-----------

I believe that a site visit to my home is essential in order to appreciate the significant impact the application from 1F will have on my family should it be approved.

Thank you for considering my objection and I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

Alexander Sebba
