

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/4416P	Brian Johnston Sue Emmett	23/10/2018 15:46:31	OBJ	

Dear Mr Josh Lawlor,

Re: Planning application 2018/4416/P for Flat 1, 29 Mackeson Road, London NW3 2LU

We, [REDACTED] wish to make the following comments as part of the public consultation on the current planning application [REDACTED]. Our comments are therefore in both capacities.

We object to the application as currently submitted.

The proposal envisages a rear extension of 2 metres into the existing garden area, as well as the enclosure of some, but not all, of the side return. The rear extension is across the entire width of the existing building and the side return. The rear extension will have a flat roof.

In our view, the design, scale and mass of the proposals – in particular the rear extension part of the development – are excessive.

From the door of our rear living room, to the right we will see a wall 3 metres in height, by 2 metres into the garden – an overbearing rectangle of brick wall. This will impact adversely on our daylight coming into the rear living room. The wall is only 1.70 metres from the centre of our french windows in that room.

We also note that a flat roof to the rear extension is proposed. Its level will be at a height above the curtilage of the flat on the first floor of the building. We are unclear as to right of the current leaseholders making the planning application to encroach on the external wall at this level. We also query whether use could be made by the first floor flat of the flat roof as a balcony at some point, which would clearly very significantly infringe on our privacy.

The rectangular design is out of keeping with neighbouring houses with rear extensions – which have pitched roof designs, with the consequent significant reduction in mass and scale, and therefore visual impact and loss of light to neighbouring properties.

Also the rear extension takes the full width of the garden. The scale of the rear extension as viewed from the back of the garden is consequently greater. This is not the case with other neighbouring extensions. We would note that the development at the neighbouring no 31 Mackeson Road was further mitigated by lowering the level of the ground floor, and therefore the height of the extension roof, which was also pitched.

The extension will bring the noise of daily living from the flat into the centre of the garden area.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

The proposal also will take away just under a quarter of the current garden length and area – which in our view is excessive in scale. It also reduces the garden type amenity between the terraced housing of Mackeson Road and Cressy Road – which are part of the Mansfield Conservation Area, and which has been subject to progressive and detrimental encroachment in recent years. These gardens have existed since Victorian times, and once built over will be lost forever. There may be a detrimental effect on water drainage into neighbouring gardens, a certain loss of habitat for wildlife and a loss of pollution-reducing plant life.

The design for the side return leaves an area of open external courtyard within it. At approximately 6 square metres in size, including this as an internal area would allow for the rear extension part to be reduced very significant in scale for the same net gain in living area.

Also – while probably not a planning matter, it is of considerable concern that the proposals appear indicate the removal of the external walls to ceiling height – with presumably steel joists being constructed to take the weight of the building. As an adjoining property, there are significant potential structural risks to our property in this proposal, as well as to the flats above Flat 1, 29 Mackeson Road.

We would welcome the opportunity to discuss our concerns further with you, as well as with the applicants if appropriate.

Yours sincerely,

Sue Emmett

Brian Johnston
