

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4094/P	michael brown	16 woodsome rd nw5 1ry	26/08/2015 10:33:48	OBJ	<p>I think this application should be rejected on the following grounds:</p> <p>Over development</p> <p>The proposal is for two independent projects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A pub with B+B rooms • 2No 2-bed maisonettes for separate sale or ownership. <p>Too much building, building into the roof, into the ground , into the rear service are and even into the pavement for lift access.</p> <p>The two projects are, likely, to be separated financially if Planning Permission is granted. One project does subsidise the other. The pub loses it off street service access.</p> <p>This loss represents 40% of the pubs curtilage. That is an irreversible loss which would prejudice the long term viability of the pubs/B&B.</p> <p>Loss of the service area and its redevelopment as four store residential unit would reduce light and cause overlooking into already congested back of house and garden area for the adjoining houses on Highgate and Woodsome road. Their garden yards for these two houses are tiny and it may be relevant that the dividing wall between their gardens has been omitted, giving the appearance of a large space.</p> <p>Basement issues</p> <p>A new basement to the maisonettes and a lowered basement to the Pub are proposed.</p> <p>Regardless of all reports/surveys etc anxiety over basement formation is justifiable. The adjoining houses will have one massive foundation adjoining the pub and one shallow leg a, simple corbelled brick shallow foundation on their other party wall. Wonky. Differential movement caused by this imbalance may continue over years without redress for the house owners. Precedents for basements don't diminish this reality.</p> <p>Usage</p> <p>This is a viable pub. It is a community asset increasingly in short supply when other pubs face closure or asset stripping for their residential worth.</p> <p>Whoever runs the pub/restaurant/B&B, with its intensified usage , in the long term will find it more difficult to operate with severely restricted service access. (Ask others who run pubs, not the applicants) Improvements to the pub's kitchens and services are necessary. Losing the service yard is not the only way to achieve this.</p> <p>In the Application form the areas given are given for "Drinking establishment" with A4 usage. The reality is there is a change of use substantially to A3. The principal rooms on the Ground and First floor are even labelled Dining Room. The Applicant should clarify if it is to become a licensed restaurant. It matters to residents in the area.</p> <p>Coupling B&B rooms to a pub may be a good usage of the upper floors although others have objected on understandable grounds. The staff bedroom(s) and amenities are not identified and should be.</p> <p>A mix of pub restaurant and B&B is acceptable provided it dispenses with new basements and the sell-off of the rear service area</p> <p>Design</p> <p>Much energy has gone into the design and particularly its presentation (a 48 page Design statement!) This does not disguise the overdevelopment and basement issues.</p> <p>Pre-application advice was sought and summarised in the Application form as</p> <p>" Amend the proposed new flats façade design, consider the neighbours windows and their amenity.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>Otherwise the proposal is likely to be considered acceptable providing the considerations set out in this pre-application advice are taken into consideration when the planning application is submitted."</p> <p>I find it difficult to understand that this was the sum total of comment made by the Planners, without even reference to the basements and servicing of the pub.</p> <p>Various people have commented on the design of the maisonettes particularly as seen from the road. There is a streetscape language to how you close buildings on a corner. This is referenced with examples in the Applicant's Design statement. It can be achieved with a wall, or a building as a secondary to the terraces (or pub) which define the corner. In this application the gap is in filled by the maisonettes, not as secondary element, but as an independent building. Easier to sell. It looks too much like slotted-in bit of development.</p> <p>It is not of real concern but Internally the rooms are deceptively small with most door drawn as 60cm., "Courtyard" is 1250mm wide(4ft) etc. It is a measure of the pressure to squeeze every thing in. Having said that, there is a high degree of spatial and sectional ingenuity, just applied to the wrong brief.</p> <p>The maisonettes will adversely affect the servicing of the pub. The existing service yard where deliveries and collections can be wheeled in and stored, will be changed to a platform lift located in the Woodsome Road pavement. Additionally a second hatch is proposed to cover a stair located again in the pavement. This service access should be located with the pubs curtlage with ground level storage provided. In the proposed arrangement the pavement will become a buffer store for deliveries and waste because of the practicality of getting to the basement</p> <p>Is the Council proposing the sale or licence for this pavement area?</p> <p>The application should be rejected in favour of a much more modest scheme. I don't question the architects competence to deliver it against a better brief.</p>

regards

Michael Brown architect and resident Woodsome Road
