

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1328/P	Richard Britton	8 Lakis Close NW31JX	11/04/2017 16:19:13	OBJ	<p>Richard and Miyoko Britton, 8 Lakis Close, NW31JX</p> <p>My wife and I wish to object to this proposal.</p> <p>The current proposal is an improvement on the 2014 proposal in which the rear artist's studio was to be turned into a two-level dwelling. We note, and we assume we have understood the current proposal correctly, that the owner intends to create a living space on one level only, no excavation below the current floor level and with no facilities such as kitchenette which would enable separate habitation and perhaps, eventually, sale of the building as a separate dwelling.</p> <p>Internal and external works associated with extension to the garden annex to provide accommodation on one level, construction of a covered walkway in the garden courtyard and internal alterations including removal of ceilings to the upper level and replacement of the existing rear door to window, all in association with the main single family dwelling.</p> <p>However we see in the architects' current proposal that a portion the boundary wall separating the garden of 35 Flask Walk from Lakis Close is to be demolished. There appears to be no reason why this wall should be demolished.</p> <p>The present boundary wall is clad in climbing plants over its entirety and we wish this to be retained to soften what will otherwise be a bleak expanse of brickwork, to the considerable detriment of the aesthetics of Lakis Close. We have seen nothing in the proposal on how the architect proposes to preserve these plants while the wall is demolished and rebuilt.</p> <p>Similarly, there is no information in the proposal on exactly how the wall is to be demolished and rebuilt. Is the intention that all work should take place on the 35 Flask Walk side of the wall? This seems unlikely. The houses in Lakis Close have garages and the Close itself is insufficiently wide for cars to enter and leave the garages if other vehicles are parked in the Close. It would be completely impractical to have any but individual bricklayers working on the Close if that is what the architect intends. The problem with parked vehicles also applies to any scaffolding the contractor may plan to erect to facilitate the rebuilding work.</p> <p>Finally on this topic we can find no proposal from the architect to prevent mortar droppings from spoiling the red tarmac surface of the Close or any proposal to reimburse the residents of the Close (a private road), or Camden Council as authorisers of the work, for the costs of restoring the tarmac to its current clean condition.</p> <p>Although not directly affected, we note and fully support the objections of residents of numbers 2, 3, 4 and 9 of Lakis Close to the loss of light and air by the (so far unspecified) increase in the height of the boundary wall which results from the enlargement of the artist's studio.</p>