

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|----------|--|
| 2019/2971/P | M- J Drewitt | 29/07/2019 13:41:24 | OBJ | <p>Objections to Planning Application no: 2019/2971/P 30 Upper Park Road, London NW3 2UT page 1 of 2 I wish to object to this Planning Application for the following reasons.</p> <p>1) None of the drawings have numbers so cannot be referred to accurately except by name. The guidance notes on the Camden web site for making a Planning Application state:- " All drawings should display a title box stating the title of the drawing, the drawing number, the date, the nature of the proposed development, the site address and the scale of the drawing." 2) The rear elevation drawing marked Existing is wrong. The Planning Permission no: 2018/5104/P has been enacted with work started in early 2019. Building Regulation notification no: 19/5/01542 dated Feb 2019. The rear elevation of the garden floor has been demolished in preparation for the new extension into the garden which has now been built. The elevation of the proposed side extension cannot be considered against the original (which no longer exists) - it should be considered against the elevation of the newly built extension as per PP 2018/5104/P. 3) The plan of the proposed ground floor of the side extension labels the room facing the garden as "bedroom" whereas on the proposed section AA it is labelled as "Kitchen/dining/kitchen. In the Design and Access statement item 6.2 it states that it is a "kitchen/dining/living area" 4) The proposed plans for the side extension at both levels show the original layout in the main house. This is wrong as considerable demolitions have been carried out in the main house as per PP 2018/5104/P. Any new proposals for the side extension should be considered against these plans. EG are there going to be two kitchen/dining/living areas in the completed project? How does the proposed side extension link into the proposed plans for the main house as per 2018/5104/P.? Or is the proposed side extension going to be a separate dwelling? 5) A) The proposed plans for the side extension show it projecting out into the rear garden at lower ground floor level beyond the corner of the main building. This is contrary to the Planning Guidance for the conservation area where it is indicated that side extensions should be set in from the front and rear corners of the main building if allowed. This objection has also been raised by the BCAAC for the same reason. B) The Camden Planning policy has been to resist the infilling of the gap between these houses. This principle was applied to application referred to in item 6)C) below for alterations to the existing side extension of no: 22 Upper Park Road. The original proposal to move the street side wall of the existing extension or no. 22 forward to line up with the street side wall of no 20 was refused. The gap that existed between the existing extensions to no.22 and no. 20 at raised ground floor level had to be maintained, as a condition for the Planning Permission to be granted, even though it was only 1.3 meters wide. A full width extension over 2 floors as proposed would be totally in contradiction to the enforcement of the above requirement and Camden Planning policy. 6) Window in side wall of existing side extension to 28 Upper Park Road. A) B) The proposed plans suggest that the side wall of the extension to 28 Upper Park Road is a party wall. It is in fact a boundary wall as was evidenced in approximately 1980 when the owners of no 30 agreed to the new window in this wall at raised ground floor level. This opening was originally serving a kitchen. To suggest that its aspect can be altered is prejudicial to its future use as a kitchen as it may be the wish of the owners to restore the rear room in the extension at that level to a bedroom facing the garden, with the bathroom being moved to its original position in the small room</p> |

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

facing the street.

Objections to Planning Application no: 2019/2971/P 30 Upper Park Road, London NW3 2UT

page 2 of 2

C) A similar case arose in Planning Application no: 2016/3897/P for alterations to the existing side extension of no: 22 Upper Park Road. The existing side extension of no. 20 Upper Park Road has a window in the boundary wall at raised ground floor level which was in existence prior to an application for alterations to the extension of no. 20 Upper Park Road in 2008 no: 2008/1240/P. The officer in charge of determining the application for the proposed alterations to the side extension of no. 22 insisted that the window should not be obstructed in any way by the proposed alterations and that the aspect and view from that window should be maintained upholding the objection from the owners of no. 20. (e mail from Camden 3 Nov 2016 to Agent). This was also in the Officer's report/recommendation (item 3.1) for approval which was granted in 2017.

D) Despite an exchange of letters between myself as owner of 28 Upper Park Road and the agents for the owners of no. 30 where these objections were raised, the application still shows obstruction to this window. I therefore insist that the aspect and view from this window is not altered by any new side extension to no. 30 for the same established reasons.

7) For all of the above reasons, I consider that the application should either be withdrawn or refused.¿
