



I wish to object to some aspects of these applications:

1. I object to the plans for the buggy park shed in the front courtyard. As this is to be a structure I would oppose it. The caretaker's house is a listed building and we need to protect it in its setting in the CA. Its front elevation set back behind the empty front courtyard is a key element in its visual and listed character. A shed in this courtyard will neither preserve nor enhance this LB in the CA. The proposed building materials are also materials which are not of the consistently high quality of this building and would detract from it in their impoverishment. However even a buggy shed in this position built of high quality materials would not be acceptable. It could also easily be used for storage by the school for the two-year-olds play equipment as there is so little space in the rooms in this house for such equipment and that would be clearly even more inappropriate.

I am also not very happy about many buggies being constantly parked here if the buggy shed is refused consent. I would urge the school and its advisors to find another solution to the parking of buggies for the two-year-old provision. This has not been very well thought out. There is space nearby along the school front facade under the school name plate, accessible via the open wall arch in the courtyard and the gate to this presently unused space. The black bricks at the lowest point on this facade would not be unsuitable for storage of buggies, as is the similar space already used further along the frontage for older children's scooters and bikes. They would be secure here with entry only via the courtyard gate and could even be hidden behind a screen at the point of the railings. There might also be space available down by the stairs and under the staircase of the house or elsewhere at this lower point. The applicant can surely find another solution to the buggy park needs.

2. The proposed ramp seems unnecessarily elaborate with three runs to its entirety. It also has visually obtrusive railings and a series of 100mm steel plate edged upstands within the front courtyard of the caretaker's house which seem to be overdevelopment. If a simple single run ramp was installed then the railings would seem to be unnecessary. This is really too much clutter and visual obstruction to permit to be put in the courtyard of the LB in the CA.

3. The rooftop playground with a staircase would cause overlooking problems from Waterside Place which are patently inappropriate, and also would cause overlooking problems to Waterside Place. The affects of noise from the rooftop playground will also become easily a source of noise pollution to the residents of Waterside Place, removing their right to a peaceful enjoyment of their properties and their courtyard. There needs to be provision for another outdoor play area for the two-year olds which does not breach common sense development. If there is no staircase down from this level then the space could perhaps be used for a play area or buggy park.

For the above reasons I urge you to refuse consent for the buggy park courtyard shed and the rooftop playground, as well as to revise the ramp to a more simple plan. These all impinge on the visual character and use of a LB in the CA which it is the duty of the LA to defend and protect.

Pam White  
45 Princess Road  
London NW1 8JS

