

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/2546/P	Alan Marsh	11 College Lane London NW5 1BJ	22/06/2017 18:41:50	COMMEM PER	Drawing number P06 indicates that building access to the property is down College Lane and through the hedge and fence into Wiblin Court. It isn't. They have their own access parallel to College Lane.
2017/2546/P	james beggs	10 little green street NW5 1BL NW5 1BL	19/06/2017 22:02:00	COMMNT	<p>Application should be rejected.</p> <p>Reasons -</p> <p>Change to mid-terrace house, destroys the visual integrity of the whole - infilling of ground floor volume and extending rear staircase (not referred to).</p> <p>New roof terrace at first floor level may require to be accessible to maintain full height glazing to Bedroom No 3 - submission does not show existing side elevation to this bedroom. Is the full height glazing new, but not mentioned? If existing how is it cleaned (from mid air)?</p> <p>The elevation to the gardens is now, in this single unit, provided with an incongruous deep band of dark grey metalwork.</p> <p>If new roof terrace is required to be accessible, then a balustrade will be required to the open side overlooking the garden - not shown, not referred to.</p> <p>Overlooking of the garden to N0 9 will be now be possible, as the existing screen preventing this remains located on one floor below. Overlooking not identified.</p> <p>The site boundary on drawing in the notice displayed in College Lane is incorrect</p> <p>Drawing No 4888 P06 "suggests" that construction access will be via College Lane. Not identified in the document. Expect strong opposition from residents, especially as the Wiblin Mews development includes a parallel access within the site served by a vehicular access at one end. Note - the drawing shows an incorrect landscaping layout omitting this footway.</p> <p>The only north point on the drawings is incorrect by 90 degrees therefore all references to direction of views etc are incorrect and any interpretation of daylight and sunlight - crucial to the understanding of residential developments is in this case both incorrect and misleading.</p> <p>Unprofessional.</p> <p>Neighbourhoods depend on submissions of a much greater quality than displayed by this application if they are to be respected and improved.</p> <p>The office of the agent for developments on this site are familiar with both listed buildings and conservation area sensitivities, but yet again information relative to this site is well below the standards of professional care. We know not why.</p> <p>REJECT</p>