

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/2896/P	Jennie Norwood	45 Ravenshaw Street	19/07/2016 07:34:53	OBJ	<p>For the attention of: Mr. Raymond Yeung Application number : 2016/2896/P Address of site : 1A Glastonbury Street, London NW6 1QJ I write to strongly OBJECT to the proposal on the following grounds:</p> <p>1. Basement development</p> <p>I appreciate that the basement development is not a planning issue but I wish to remind you that (a) the houses in the area were built in the 1890s as relatively low value houses by speculative developers and consequently do not have very deep foundations; this has not been adequately dealt with in the Basement Impact Assessment which simply states that the depth of the foundations are to be confirmed. I would have thought that this should form one of the main thrusts of the BIA to alleviate any concerns that neighbouring residents have. (b) the houses are built on London Clay which, as the Impact Assessment attests, is notorious for its' instability. (c) three of the five houses in Glastonbury Street have been underpinned in the last few years. (d) the site is within less than 100 metres of a very busy railway line. When goods trains pass (especially those carrying aggregate etc) the houses move slightly.</p> <p>Taking these points into account (shallow foundations, unstable London Clay, recent underpinning in the immediate vicinity, ground movement when heavy trains pass) the risk of damage to our properties is more than just a "possibility"; I am not at all confident or reassured by the conclusions reached by the Basement Impact Assessment.</p> <p>2. The general design and, in particular, the pitched roof , UPVC windows and UPVC front door The pitched roof worries me as it gives scope for living space in the future that could be secured without having to go through the planning process. In addition, having a pitched roof means that my neighbours have to look at a third storey that need not be there. The neighbouring houses on Ravenshaw Street are lower than the site and the perspective from their windows is that the proposed development will be much higher than the drawings show.</p> <p>The materials being used on the proposed development do not fit in with the majority of the properties in the surrounding streets – the use of UPVC for the windows and front door is simply a cheap method of attempting to replicate the wooden doors and frames of the surrounding Victorian buildings.</p> <p>There was scope here to design an elegant, modern property which could have acted as a foil to the Victorian terraces in the nearby streets. Instead we have a pastiche; a lazy piece of architecture which attempts to secure planning permission by emulating the surrounding buildings. There are plenty of examples of infills where clever, quiet, innovative buildings sit peaceably with their neighbours ; why can't we have one of those instead of a "Barratt Home"?</p> <p>3. Garden wall between the proposed development and the neighbouring houses I join with my neighbours in objecting to the proposed replacement of a lovely old brick wall which is contemporary with the Victorian houses by a wooden fence. The fence will need to be maintained whilst the existing wall has stood for over 100 years. There should be a like for like replacement to</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p data-bbox="1099 132 2063 154">preserve the "local character and history" as outlined in your Planning Design Access Statement 3.5.</p> <p data-bbox="1099 196 1294 218">4. Change of use</p> <p data-bbox="1099 228 2096 378">I am a chartered surveyor specialising in commercial property; I know how these things work so I asked one of my colleagues to approach the letting/selling agent for details; they were told that the lessor/vendor was not really interested in letting or selling the property and that they were having difficulty in getting instructions from him when they had secured offers. I leave you to draw your own conclusions as to the "marketing" of the property.</p> <p data-bbox="1099 416 1794 474">In conclusion, I object strongly to this application on the above grounds. Jennie Norwood</p>
