Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/3502/P	Jane Burkitt	16 Raveley STreet London NW5 2HU	26/07/2016 16:22:56	COMMNT	I have reviewed the detail of this application alongside the detail contained within the CPG guidance documents 1 & 6. Whilst I am supportive in principle of the intent to improve and extend the property, I have several comments / questions regarding the detail of the proposal, as set out below. 1 – Having looked at the height and depth of the proposed extension, I am keen to understand the potential impact on levels of daylight and sunlight in neighbouring properties and gardens, as the extension is taller than others and goes further out into the garden than others in the street. I would request that Camden evaluate this. (IN LINE WITH CPG 6 SECTION 6.4 AND CPG 1 SECTION 4.9, 4.10) 2 – In terms of materials, I have concerns about the significant increase in the amount of uPVC when you consider the 18 Raveley Street building in total (although the building is currently split into individual flats, they have the same owner.) I am concerned that uPVC is not ideal both from an aesthetic and environmental perspective. The proposal is to replace the existing softwood door with uPVC and to install new uPVC windows. Whilst the some of the existing lower ground floor windows are uPVC, the majority of other windows in the property are wooden. Increasing the area of windows in the lower ground and having these as uPVC does not support preservation of the character of the surrounding area. I would suggest that wooden doors and windows would be a more appropriate alternative to ensure the application remains in the style of the original property – this would also ensure that the ageing process for the new extension contributes more positively to the character of the flat and it's wider context including neighbouring properties. (IN LINE WITH CPG 1 SECTION 2.12, 4.7, 4.9, 4.11) 3 – In terms of shape and scale of the extension, I have some concerns about the 3m height and depth included on the plans. I am fully supportive of the desire to extend and improve the property. However, I believe that this should be done in a way which respects and preserves the original design and proportions of the buildings, including their architectural period and style. I would question whether an extension which is significantly taller and deeper than others on this side of Raveley Street is fulfilling that need. Were the extension at the same height as the extension to the rear of the neighbouring property at 20 Raveley Street, and a similar distance into the garden to other nearby extensions the same side of Raveley Street, I would be considerably more comfortable that the original design and proportions of the building were being respected, as well as the character of the surrounding area. (IN LINE WITH CPG 1 SECTION 4.9, 4.10, 4.24)