

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4756/P	Ewan Sefton-Smith	1a Lupton Street NW5 2JA	24/09/2017 19:27:46	OBJ	<p>The original plans for building 17 Railey Mews were well thought out, although the proposed house was much larger than the one-storey architect's studio on the site, it was designed to minimise the impact on its immediate neighbours (and I raised no objection to it):</p> <p>i) there were no windows overlooking 1 and 1a Lupton Street and its garden, and</p> <p>ii) although there was a high blank wall at the bottom of the garden, this only extended to around half its length, the rest being set back, and so did not dominate the view from the rear windows of 1 and 1a Lupton Street.</p> <p>I strongly object to the new plans which would reverse these elements of the original design (and without which, it is assumed, planning would not have been granted). There are four main objections.</p> <p>1) The proposed lightwell window faces directly the rear windows of 1 and 1a Lupton Street (it is not shown on the plan to have frosted glass), and although this is screened by cladding, what is to prevent this cladding being removed at a later date? The cladding does not prevent this window overlooking parts of the garden of 1a Lupton Street; any window overlooking the garden and rear of 1 and 1a Lupton Street is directly contrary to the nature of the original application.</p> <p>2) The wall of the house would now extend at the full height of the building for almost the whole width of the garden, bringing it much closer to the back of 1 and 1a Lupton Street and greatly increasing its visual impact (and this would similarly affect 3 and 5 Lupton Street); this again is contrary to the spirit of the original application.</p> <p>3) The plans show a roof terrace with 'hedges to hide balustrades' and a 'retractable ladder for roof maintenance'; this will be extremely intrusive for the upper rooms of 1a Lupton Street and I strongly object to this legitimisation of a terrace that has, in effect, already been constructed. Why are balustrades necessary for 'roof maintenance', or a permanent ladder?</p> <p>4) The excavation of the basement contravenes the terms of TPO C869 protecting the lime tree in the garden of 1a Lupton Street, the base of which is around four to five metres from the proposed excavation. The protected rooting area of this tree under the TPO is 9 metres as assessed by the council tree officer in 2009. The tree is now considerably taller than it was in 2009, around 14 to 15 metres, a protected rooting area of less than 5 metres would be insufficient for a tree of this height.</p> <p>A planning application for a structure in the garden of 1a Lupton Street (2010/4501/P), alongside the wall of 17 Railey Mews, was granted on the condition it could be shown by air-spade investigation that any disturbance of the soil would not cause damage to the roots, yet the excavation of the basement of Railey Mews must sever all the roots on that side four to five metres from the trunk.</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

The tree impact assessment (section 5) states that no work will be carried out in the rooting area of the tree, this being argued on the basis that the roots are not likely to have extended under 17 Railey Mews. However, 17 Railey Mews is built on a system of piles supporting a reinforced concrete frame, rather than on deep continuous foundations, leaving ample room for roots to grow under the building within the 9 metre protected area.

The garage for off-street parking that was part of the original plan was incorporated into the living area some time ago, with these proposed changes all the other elements that might have recommended the original plan will have been removed.

I notice that the plans as submitted make no mention of the potential impact on 1 and 1a Lupton Street.

I would like to be notified of the date of the committee hearing.
