

## **Comments on Planning Application 2015/6602/P: 9A Evangelist Road**

*Please note that these comments should be read in conjunction with our comments on the parallel planning application 2015/6603/P for the upper parts of the same property, 9B Evangelist Road*

We wish to object to a number of features of the proposals, and draw your attention to some points where there is a lack of clarity which makes it difficult to evaluate them. We would also like to suggest some modifications which would make for a more acceptable proposal. The plans are for a permanent structural extension to replace the present conservatory, and extending all the way across to our wall. While we have no objection in principle to the creation of a permanent lateral extension of the original rear extension, we are opposed to a number of features of the present proposals. These are as follows:

1. The plans indicate that the extension would continue beyond the end of our extension, alongside a stretch of the wall of our garden. This is clearly not aesthetically pleasing and would be an unsatisfactory encroachment. We propose that the extension should end in line with ours.
2. Although they are not very clear on this point, the plans appear to indicate that the flat roof would be at a higher level than ours, giving rise to interference with our present parapet wall and coping stones. This would be most unattractive. We believe that it would be more in keeping if the proposed flat roof were at the same level as ours.
3. The parallel application 2015/6603/P includes a substantial first floor extension plus roof terrace on top of the main existing rear extension, similar to one recently built at No. 13. We would like to retain the possibility of building a similar one on our property and would be most unhappy if the lateral extension proposed included any design features which could compromise a future planning application which we might make. This could include our ability to reinforce the foundations of our rear extension, and also any issues regarding reduction of light falling on the roof light of the proposed lateral extension of No. 9.
4. There is no indication as to how rain water drainage from the proposed flat roof would be achieved.

We have discussed these plans with the owners of No. 9, who have indicated that they will consider modifications to their application to deal with these points. In particular we understand that they will examine the possibility of reducing the length of their original extension so that a lateral extension will coincide with the end of ours, with the full width rear extension thus squared off. They will also consider ensuring that plans are for a flat roof at the same height as ours.

Brian and Tessa Evans, 7 Evangelist Road, NW5 1UA, 22 March 2016