Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Printed on: 18/09/2017 09:10:0	:03
2017/4567/P	James Herbertson	67 Falkland Road London NW5 2XB	15/09/2017 08:52:02	COMMNT	We happy to see an application that takes in to account the concerns raised at the last application (two storeys that was not granted) and appears to be in keeping with the height of the current storage space. Our concerns relate to the actual dimensions of the proposal especially the height, the intrusion, the quality of the living space and the trees & vegetation.	
					No section drawings have been shown, indicating the floor to ceiling height of the proposal, the roof depth or rooflight form. It is therefore unclear whether the elevation onto the street as shown is likely to be achieved or whether roof lights and other items may protrude. Similarly there lacks clarity on the patio section facing on to number 69 and the view over adjacent properties & back gardens.	
					The street elevation shows a sash style bedroom window directly onto the street. While the bedroom would no doubt benefit from daylight and view, this feels very abrupt and is not a feature within the street zone of the area. A similar window from the kitchen space is equally awkward.	
					The handling of the street elevation does not preserve or enhance the quality of the conservation area.	
					The bedroom and the rear and dining/living area have outlook onto a very small patio about 6m2. This provides a very limited view from these spaces indeed. This would not appear to an adequate outdoor amenity area for a two bedroom dwelling such as this.	
					The design statement indicated that the gross internal floor area of the flat is 64m2. When the internal habitable area measured is closer to 59m2 which is less than the national minimum space standard. The external walls appear to have been drawing around 300mm thick. At building control stage the SAP assessment is likely to require these walls to be built closer to 400mm thick which reduce the overall floor space of the dwelling and that of the individual rooms. An increase in wall thickness of this much could reduce the floor area by a further 3m2.	
					The dwelling does not appear to have been designed to meet current practise in regard to accessibility.	
					There are trees in Montpellier Grove that have not been surveyed or shown on the drawings. These are likely to be damaged during the construction process. There is also a large tree at the rear of no 67 Falkland Rd which has not been noted either and no arboricultural assessment has been made as to whether the works could affect this. It appears that the formation of the new dwelling will require excavation for a new insulated slab and foundations to new cavity walls. No drainage runs or other utility connections have been shown which makes assessing damage to trees in the pavement very difficult.	