



Application No: 2015/7235/P
Consultees Name: AD and JM Keith
Consultees Addr: 75 Harwood Street
NW1 8DJ
Received: 18/01/2016 18:30:33 OJB
Comment:
Response: This is an addition to our previous objection comment (dated 16 January 2015).
The proposed extension at 73 Harwood Street will have an adverse visual effect light reduction effect.
If it is built, on one side there will be a visually top heavy structure (the applicant's proposed flat parapet wall). This would be in stark adverse contrast to our existing smaller sloping parapet on the other side (our design, which has matching parapets each side at present).
The applicant is proposing a destruction of a design we conceived and paid for, in order to achieve some overall visual order.
The proposed triangular parapet addition (approx. 14 feet long) will reduce the amount of light enjoyed at present in our rear extension (through our rooflights) and we object to this.





Application No: 2015/7235/P **Consultees Name:** AD and JM Keith **Consultees Addr:** 75 Harwood Street NW1 8DT **Received:** 16/01/2016 10:03:15 **Comment:** OBJ

Response:

This is a replacement for comment submitted yesterday (15 Jan.). We submitted as an Interested Party due to a keyboard error. This present comment is officially an Objection.

We are neighbours to the proposed project. Its plans include the statement "Line of ...existing sloping parapet to be removed and wall raised in brickwork to new level parapet".

We object to the proposal because it involves interference in the structure of our house. It would damage the weatherproof party wall previously built at our expense (Camden Planning ref. 2009/3167/P). The existing party wall is large enough to allow our neighbour to build a substantial extension without having this adverse interference with our home.

To ensure our party wall was to be dampproof and weatherproof, our extension project in 2010 involved complex and costly knitting the party wall, roof tiles, correct flashing, angle of coping, integration of glazing frames &c. We strongly object to any proposal to "un-knit" these composite aspects of our extension parapet wall and glazed roof.

If the applicant wants to build a flat roof which is lower than our parapet level, and which would not affect our structure and our dampproofing, and would be in compliance with Party Wall law, this can be discussed.

We object to being attached to a flat roof extension joined to our house in the manner proposed. Flat roofs do not cope with heavy rainfall as well as sloping ones. Increasing rainfall due to changing climate will make the problem worse in future.

The applicant is obliged to comply with Party Wall Act. This means instructing a party wall surveyor, and to pay for party wall surveyor instructed by neighbours affected. Surveyors are then to agree methods and processes of what is to be done to the party wall. The proposed works must not of course interfere with, or reduce effectiveness of, our insulation, dampproofing and weatherproofing. Surveyors must reach agreement over methods.

2015/7235/P AD and JM Keith 75 Harwood St. NW1 8DT 15/01/2016 11:27:01 INT

We are neighbours to the proposed project. Published plans include North Elevation Proposed, stating "Line of our existing sloping parapet to be removed and wall raised in brickwork to new level parapet".

The plans involve works affecting neighbours' property, so obviously applicant is obliged to comply with Party Wall Act. This means instructing a party wall surveyor, and to pay for party wall surveyor instructed by neighbours affected. Surveyors are then to agree methods and processes of what is to be done to the party wall. The proposed works must not of course interfere with, or reduce effectiveness of, neighbours' dampproofing, and/or weatherproofing. Surveyors must reach agreement over methods.

