

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3798/P	Mrs J Scott	62 Meadowbank London NW3 3AY	03/09/2015 19:01:07	OBJEMAIL	<p>It is very unfortunate that in this case the Architect has chosen to take one of the worst extensions, that of No 40, as his model for development. The roof extension at No 40 is a classic example of a lumpen overdevelopment which loses one of the attractive features of these houses, the roof terrace leading from living/bedroom space at third floor level. It replaces this with an awkward "terrace" on the very top which is remote from any of the facilities of the house and will almost certainly seldom be used. The original design of the houses provide a small terrace at the ground floor allowing a private space for sitting out and providing a buffer space between the wide glass windows and the communal garden. The ground floor extension, which builds on 80% of the already small private patio, reduces the 2.3m deep terrace to 800mm. This removes the existing private buffer space between communal garden and living room. An 800mm wide strip of land is totally inadequate to provide sitting room for a 4 bedroom family house. The impact of this reduction in open space in an already overcrowded garden space between dwellings will mean that the communal garden will be used more intensively.</p> <p>The Design Access statement cites other cases in the development where ground floor extensions have been built as being a good "precedent", however it should be noted that where these ground floor extensions have been built, the owners have the curtains drawn or blinds down for almost 100% of the time to maintain privacy in their homes, meaning that both the residents of the extended houses and the users of the communal garden lose the quality of the original design.</p> <p>A few years ago the then owners of No 41 Oppidans Road successfully challenged the planning application of their neighbours at No 40 to build an almost identical extension on the grounds of loss of light and privacy. The challenge to the Planning Decision was taken to appeal by the owners of No 40 so not only the Planning Authority but also the Planning Inspector agreed with the contention that the proposal to extend at the ground floor was detrimental over-development of the site. It would be bizarre if this current application were now granted to the detriment of the owners at No. 40.</p> <p>The construction of a bicycle store and bin store at the front intrudes into the street elevation and again takes up more of the very limited outside space. It would be preferable to incorporate this into the main facade of the house as has been done in other examples in Meadowbank.</p>
2015/3798/P	Mrs J Scott	62 Meadowbank London NW3 3AY	03/09/2015 19:01:30	OBJEMAIL	