

Printed on: 03/09/2018 09:10:05

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/2664/P	David Scott	31/08/2018 20:29:33	OBJLETTE R	Please refer to separate email to Tony Young objecting to the proposal in its current form.
2018/2664/P	David Scott	31/08/2018 20:29:46	OBJLETTE R	Please refer to separate email to Tony Young objecting to the proposal in its current form.

**From:** David Scott  
**Sent:** 04 September 2018 11:09  
**To:** Young, Tony  
**Cc:** Fieldsend, Sofie  
**Subject:** Application 2018/2664/P - 39 Sarre Road

FAO Tony Young

Dear Mr Young,

I am an owner/ occupier [REDACTED], I placed an objection on line on 1st Sept to the above application although I appeared to have an incorrect email address for you to write in at the same time.

In support of No 37 Sue Burkes objection, I also request planning to refuse this application in its current form. I am copying in Sofie Fieldsend as Sofie is currently dealing with a similar application for the side extension to 31 Sarre Road, application 2018/695/P. Revised drawings for 31 went up on the web site on Friday last, we still have concerns on these which will be relayed to Sofie following this email.

On behalf of all owners and residents 15-41 Sarre Road we would request a common approach be considered by planning to extending these properties. ( apart from nos.17 & 21 which have rear side extensions approved in the early to mid-1980's, these are to ground floor flats, photos sent to Sofie) there are no other rear or side extensions along this row of properties that set a precedent under more recent planning guidelines.

I am informed that the applicant formerly approached their adjoining owners suggesting a wraparound rear and side extension which was strongly objected to. Whilst we are pleased to see the application has been reduced to a side extension my comments here are similar to comments made to 31 application. I am also pleased to see how the Architect has lowered the roof to part of the extension to maintain a reasonably size window to the ground floor rear reception room.

In order to preserve and enhance the form and character of the run of Edwardian houses 15-41, and to reduce the impact of extensions on neighbouring houses opposite the closet wings (refer also to Camden Planning Guidance notes for development and extending our homes), I would make the following points for your additional consideration in allowing extensions beyond the 3m that would be allowed under permitted development.

1. The height of the extension parallel to the boundary should be reduced to a maximum of 2.5 m in height to the eaves. The revised drawings to 31 have been reduced.
2. The extension should be set in from the rear (ref 17 & 21 referred to above).
3. This extension can be seen from the street. The extension should be set in from the side of the main house by least 300mm in order to a) reduce its impact as seen from the passers by; to help reduce the impact on the adjoining property for an extension iro 5m long; to enable wheelchair/ access to the rear garden for lifetime homes ( 950mm from the existing fence, 900 from the fence posts which can easily be achieved, planning may want more).

A side elevation and a cross section to illustrate the proposals more fully from 37 has not been provided.

I am not sure whether there is a computer error on the proposed drawings but the boundary fence between 37 -39 has been removed and a new fence positioned tight up to the boundary? This would not allow any side access into the rear garden of 39. Sue Burke has stated she does not want her fence highbred ( or removed) there is likely to be legal implications in doing this.

On behalf of everyone we would ask planning officers to consult and agree on designs for side extensions.

Yours sincerely,

David Scott

Dip. Arch. ARB RIBA

Director

DAVID SCOTT

ARCHITECTS

---

**From:** David Scott

**Sent:** 04 September 2018 12:21

**To:** Young, Tony

**Cc:** Fieldsend, Sofie

**Subject:** Re: Application 2018/2664/P - 39 Sarre Road

Tony, a typo in my penultimate paragraph which should read '*has been removed and a new fence positioned tight up to the **side of the extension***'

David Scott

Dip. Arch. ARB RIBA

Director

DAVID SCOTT

ARCHITECTS