

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/0902/P	Lois George	02/06/2021 20:45:49	OBJ	<p>Dear Sir/ Madam,</p> <p>I am writing to OBJECT to Planning Application 2021/0902/P. Flat1,10 Weech Road, NW6 1DL The demolition of a small extension, replacing it with a single story extension and a small courtyard.</p> <p>I am objecting on the following grounds:- The proposed single storey rear extension is too large, too high, it is out of proportion to others around it, If approved it will set a precedence.</p> <p>The proposed extension would 8m from the rear wall of the original building on the left side and over 9m. on the right hand side. the proposal would be over 3.5m high and takes up the full width of the garden, 6.8m wide. The CPG adopted 15/1/21, clause2.1.1 states the rear extension shall 'have a height, depth and width that respects the existing common pattern and rhythm of rear extensions at neighbouring sites,...' No10 is one of 5 houses in a terrace of five built in approx 1864, the first houses in Weech Road and all follow the same pattern on having a small extension at the ground floor rear. Any extensions have been sympathetic to closely following the building line at the rear, This has helped maintain 'the common pattern and rhythm at the rear of neighbouring sites..'</p> <p>There are other designs of houses in groups in the road and their extensions are in proportion to there size and with there neighbours. This too helps create a rhythm to the rear of the houses in the road. This new proposal will certainly stick out like a sore thumb because of it lack of respect for the height, depth and width of existing common pattern at neighbouring sites.</p> <p>The GIA of the present property is approx 58sqm. The proposed plans state the new development will have a GIA of 50.6 sqm. This would increase the footprint by nearly 100% The CPG(15/1/21) clause 2.1.1 states that rear extensions 'be subordinate to the building being extended, in relation to it's form, footprint, scale, proportion, dimensions and detailing.' This does no appear to be the case with this proposal.</p> <p>As stated previously houses No. 9 to13 built 160 years ago in the orchard of a large house. There are only 2 apple trees surviving and one abuts the fence line in No 11/s garden with No.10. I have not been able to find anything in the document recognise the importance of this ancient tree. There are no plans shown how the proposed building works will protect and not encroach on the trees feeding roots in the top layers of the soil, or how the deep roots providing stability will not be harmed-which would threaten the life off this amazing apple tree.</p> <p>In the core planning principles (para.17) of the NPPF states planning 'should always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.' ...'and should contribute to making places better for people.' If this proposal is accepted it will be ignoring the NPPF.,,The CPG only adopted in 15/1/21. The proposed extension has been shown in all the above email to be out of character, overbearing and dominant - totally out of character within it's setting. If accepted this proposal will set a dangerous and unwelcome precedent in the area. On all the above grounds I am objecting to this proposal and asking for it to be refused</p>