

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/0776/P		21/04/2020 13:41:36	COMMNT	<p>1. Choicecrest Ltd / the freeholder, has not received in writing any plans and specifications for the proposed alteration. The planning application states that the requisite notice of the planning application has to be given to the landlord. No such notice has been received by or any agent on her behalf</p> <p>2. The applicant (and leaseholder) has submitted an application for planning permission in his own name dated 17 February 2020. The application was prepared by Shelley White of Absolute Lofts. Any proposed alterations should have been submitted by Choicecrest Ltd / C. Steyn, the freeholder, in accordance with the lease between the applicant leaseholder and freeholder.</p> <p>3. By the terms of the lease the applicant does not have the right to extend the property beyond the ceiling of his flat. His demise is up to the ceiling, but not including the roof of the property. The roof and roof space belongs to the freeholder, not the applicant.</p> <p>4. The freeholder considers the structure of property and foundations are not strong enough to bear the additional loading that would result from the proposed alteration and construction and use. No survey has been arranged to support the viability of the alteration.</p> <p>5. The freeholder considers the proposed alteration and addition is not compatible with the building and with other buildings in the immediate vicinity and is a protruding eyesore which would damage the aesthetics of the building in a conservation area and adjoining properties. In particular, this would create an asymmetry with the twin side of the detached house. She wishes to know if planning permission been granted for similar alterations in nearby properties (2 floors within the roof areas, resulting in a dormer on top of an existing dormer)</p>
2020/0776/P		20/04/2020 15:20:27	INT	<p>The proposed development affects my property in several ways:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Loss of Symmetry in the design 2) Size of Dormer Windows 3) Top heavy appearance of whole design 4) Overlooking our Garden at rear <p>Please consider this an Objection</p>
2020/0776/P		20/04/2020 20:29:59	OBJ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Overlooking/Privacy: rear dormer is overlooking our rear garden from a higher viewpoint, directly impacting our privacy, - Concerns about structural impact on our flat on the floor below: no survey established, property not designed for weight of additional floor. We have already observed structural moves in our flat (paint cracks, leaks, etc.) - Upsets the symmetry of the pair of houses (10 & 12) from the front view, with proposed side dormer visible from the front as well as proposed rooflight - Aesthetics: proposed side and rear dormers look out of proportion to existing dormers - Aesthetics: proposed dormers are already on top of existing dormers, giving top heavy appearance to whole design. There is no visible example of third floor dormers in the "Crofts" area - Camden planning guidance breach: proposed side dormer not aligned with windows on lower floors. Size of side and rear dormers much larger than windows below. Side dormer seems to cut through the roof ridge/hipped roof