

Gentet, Matthias

From: Patrick McQuaid [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 May 2017 09:46
To: Planning
Cc: Stavrou, Steve
Subject: Objection to Application 2017/1753/P 119 Lower Ground Floor Canfield Gardens NW6 3DY Variation of condition 2

Dear Sirs,

Application 2017/1753/P 119 Lower Ground Floor Canfield Gardens NW6 3DY Variation of condition 2 (Drawings) and details in pursuant of condition 3 (Material samples) of granted appeal APP/X5210/A/11/2165313 dated 25/05/2012 under [Ref: 2011/3875/P] and as varied by 2012/6892/P dated 18/02/2013 for erection of single-storey rear extension Retrospective

We are writing to **object** to the above application. According to the information available on line, the documents submitted include the Appeal decision APP/X5210/A/11/2165313 and four photographs.

In the Appeal decision, paragraph 8, the Inspector refers to the importance of the green roof which improves the appearance of the building from elevated views. In paragraph 10 he makes similar comments about the rest of the materials as seen from the garden of number 119, and from the wider setting. These materials relate in particular to the matching brickwork.

In the section 'Conditions and Conclusions' he specifically requires that there be conditions both to carry out the design in accordance with the submitted plans, to control the materials used to protect the character of the building and to fulfil a condition requiring the submission of the roof details, requiring that the roof be provided and retained. A brochure was submitted among the documents in the planning application 2011/3875/P referred to by the Inspector, but this does not form part of the documentation referred to in the decision.

The drawings show bricks as cladding to the building. No side elevation is provided to show the side against 121 Canfield Gardens and, while part of this elevation is hidden by 121, much of it is exposed as it extends beyond and above the lower ground floor of 121. Much of this wall was in crude blockwork with poor jointing. The applicant has now rendered this part of the wall which is clearly visible both from the roof windows of the lower ground flat in 121, from the upper floors and from the garden of 121. While in principle we have no objection to the render which is also used in their own small internal courtyard, it has been carried out to a very inferior standard and not as well as has been done within their own courtyard.

There is no reference to the use of render in the application and we consider that the application is therefore incomplete and should be **refused** as it stands. We would however be satisfied with a condition which confirms the acceptance of the render but with a proviso that the quality of the finish should be improved within a period of say six months to match that of the light well.

With regard to the green roof, this is referred to in the drawings listed by the inspector, however there are no details provided as is required by the Inspector. It is not clear whether the material used is the same as that in the brochure referred to above but, even if it is, that document and the maintenance of the roof in accordance with those details is not referred to and so has no standing. Again, as the application stands, we consider that it should be **refused**. We are not however opposed to the principle of a green roof and our main concern is to ensure the long term future of that roof and we suggest that the applicant be required to supply full details of the system, confirmation that it has been installed in accordance with those details, and an undertaking to retain and to maintain (see paragraph 15 of the Inspector's decision) the roof in accordance with those details.

We appreciate that the current owner was not the original developer but consider that this provides no excuse for not complying with the Inspector's requirements in determining the appeal.

Yours faithfully,

Patrick and Nicola McQuaid

--

Patch McQuaid
ID Audio

