

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6629/P	Julie Stanhope	8 Strauss Road Chiswick W4 1DL	12/01/2016 16:50:11	OBJEMAIL	<p>As the owner of the top floor flat at No 16 Parsifal I object to this application where the works have already been undertaken despite knowing from both their purchase of the property and engagement of professionals to effect the same this permission should have been sought. This is indicative of their refusal to acknowledge the significance of owning a property within a conservation area or the considerable impact of these works on No 16.</p> <p>The distinguishing feature of many properties within Parsifal Road is their frontage with particular reference to the front steps and entrances. Some of the properties are semi detached and as such joined properties should be viewed as a whole and the impact on the same when considering such applications particularly where as in this current application there is a symmetry between the two dwellings. The proposals dilute the streets existing historical harmony to the detriment of the whole street and more particularly the combined properties at No16 and 18 become aesthetically unbalanced and any existing architectural and aesthetic coherence is lost.</p> <p>The proposed application in respect of No. 8 (2009/5906/P) stated</p> <p>"The proposed excavation will not result in an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the original building given that it will not be visible from the public realm, whilst the proposed windows at the basement will match existing, but will be smaller in size.</p> <p>The proposed works to No 18 are clearly visible from the public realm given the depth of the basement steps: new and not replacement window installed. The frontage to No 8 differed significantly to that of No 6 and therefore the issue of maintaining a uniform frontage between the 2 semi detached properties did not apply when that application was granted.</p> <p>It should be noted that when the steps to No 18 were dug railings which have now been removed were installed. There is now a significant drop into this area which presents as a safety hazard. To answer this point railings or fencing would have to be installed which would exacerbate the visual blight caused by these steps.</p> <p>Works already undertaken at No 18 have already impacted on No 16 which was subjected to some underpinning work in 1998. This is the subject of an on going dispute between ourselves and the applicant who has sought to suggest that this damage which only arose with the commencement of works last year to No 18 was due to either pre-existing subsidence work or the tree at the front of our property. Our structural surveyors report discounted either of the aforementioned causes as being responsible for the damage to our property. The applicant continues to refuse to accept responsibility for the damage to No. 16 and the dispute is therefore still ongoing. Significantly they are not even prepared to indicate what other works, if any, are anticipated so that we can effect the necessary repairs to our property. We believe that further works of the type proposed by No 18 will exacerbate the potential for damage to our property.</p> <p>It should be noted that the proposed works are unsightly and clearly visible from our property and potentially may have an adverse impact to the structure of no 16. I also have no faith given the manner in which the existing application has been made after the proposed works have been executed that other works to the basement area with specific reference to lowering the basement floor internally have not also been undertaken as at one stage last year we were advised of a proposed party wall agreement for this purpose which was inexplicably not proceeded with although the works which are the subject matter of this application were.</p>