

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2146/P	Clive truman	03/07/2021 20:33:08	PETITNOBJ E	<p>Dear Enya Fogarty</p> <p>Old Hall Lodge Kidderpore Gardens London NW3 7SR 2021/2146/P: Ground floor rear and side extension including a roof-light. First floor bay window reconfiguration to rear. New entrance door to front elevation. Extension of main roof including front, rear and side dormer windows.</p> <p>1. We are the owner and occupiers of Old Hall cottage 4b Kidderpore Avenue. This comprises the main house and a separate lower ground floor flat in the adjoining building to the south of the application site.</p> <p>Graphical user interface, diagram, application</p> <p>Description automatically generated</p> <p>2. We strongly object to the proposed rear extension (identified in red above) which will overshadow and over-dominate the lower side window of No 4b, which lights a living room.</p> <p>3. A set of comparison plans and elevations that explain the objection are attached.</p> <p>4. The first shows the plan of Old Hall Lodge. The north elevation of No 4 is the hatched rectangle at the top of the sheet. It shows that the two dwellings are staggered, with the rear of Old Hall lodge where the extensions are proposed being about halfway along the north side of No 4b</p> <p>image009.jpg</p> <p>5. The No 4b existing and Old Hall Lodge's proposed adjacent side elevations are shown below in the relationship shown on the plan above. It is necessary to invert Old Hall Lodge's current application to get proper sense of the relationship between the two dwellings. The proposal is red-lined.</p> <p>image010.png No. 4b (side elevation) image011.pngimage012.pngimage013.png Timber cladding replacement bay at first floor level and the ground floor extension</p> <p>6. Note that the two dwellings are only about 1m apart at this point. The lower of the two side windows lighting Flat 4b is below front ground floor level and the other is at ground level with an outlook past Old Hall Lodge's rear elevation.</p> <p>7. The proposed rear extension is in front of both windows. The only daylight they receive is from the north behind Old Hall Lodge's existing rear elevation. This will be blocked for both windows by the proposed extension, which will cause a serious loss of daylight to both as well as a loss of outlook from the upper window.</p> <p>8. The proposal unacceptably affects their amenity and should be refused.</p> <p>9. It is also harmful to the Redington Frogna Conservation Area because of its appearance. The proposed flat roofed, full width plus wrap around, timber cladding / render extension, with full height glazing would represent an unsympathetic addition to the building which would harm the heritage and townscape</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				merits of the building.
				10. In addition, the reconfiguration of the first-floor rear bay window is also harmful as its replacement is over dominant with inappropriate materials which would detract from the form and style of the building.
				11. It is also important to note, both the rear and side (north) dormers are inconsistent with the Council's Home Improvements CPG which requires consideration of the hierarchy of window openings which should result in smaller dormer windows than the ones at lower levels.
				Sincerely
				Clive and Susan Truman

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2146/P	Clive truman	03/07/2021 20:33:07	PETITNOBJ E	<p>Dear Enya Fogarty</p> <p>Old Hall Lodge Kidderpore Gardens London NW3 7SR 2021/2146/P: Ground floor rear and side extension including a roof-light. First floor bay window reconfiguration to rear. New entrance door to front elevation. Extension of main roof including front, rear and side dormer windows.</p> <p>1. We are the owner and occupiers of Old Hall cottage 4b Kidderpore Avenue. This comprises the main house and a separate lower ground floor flat in the adjoining building to the south of the application site.</p> <p>Graphical user interface, diagram, application</p> <p>Description automatically generated</p> <p>2. We strongly object to the proposed rear extension (identified in red above) which will overshadow and over-dominate the lower side window of No 4b, which lights a living room.</p> <p>3. A set of comparison plans and elevations that explain the objection are attached.</p> <p>4. The first shows the plan of Old Hall Lodge. The north elevation of No 4 is the hatched rectangle at the top of the sheet. It shows that the two dwellings are staggered, with the rear of Old Hall lodge where the extensions are proposed being about halfway along the north side of No 4b</p> <p>image009.jpg</p> <p>5. The No 4b existing and Old Hall Lodge's proposed adjacent side elevations are shown below in the relationship shown on the plan above. It is necessary to invert Old Hall Lodge's current application to get proper sense of the relationship between the two dwellings. The proposal is red-lined.</p> <p>image010.png No. 4b (side elevation) image011.pngimage012.pngimage013.png Timber cladding replacement bay at first floor level and the ground floor extension</p> <p>6. Note that the two dwellings are only about 1m apart at this point. The lower of the two side windows lighting Flat 4b is below front ground floor level and the other is at ground level with an outlook past Old Hall Lodge's rear elevation.</p> <p>7. The proposed rear extension is in front of both windows. The only daylight they receive is from the north behind Old Hall Lodge's existing rear elevation. This will be blocked for both windows by the proposed extension, which will cause a serious loss of daylight to both as well as a loss of outlook from the upper window.</p> <p>8. The proposal unacceptably affects their amenity and should be refused.</p> <p>9. It is also harmful to the Redington Frogna Conservation Area because of its appearance. The proposed flat roofed, full width plus wrap around, timber cladding / render extension, with full height glazing would represent an unsympathetic addition to the building which would harm the heritage and townscape</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				merits of the building.
				10. In addition, the reconfiguration of the first-floor rear bay window is also harmful as its replacement is over dominant with inappropriate materials which would detract from the form and style of the building.
				11. It is also important to note, both the rear and side (north) dormers are inconsistent with the Council's Home Improvements CPG which requires consideration of the hierarchy of window openings which should result in smaller dormer windows than the ones at lower levels.
				Sincerely
				Clive and Susan Truman

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2146/P	Clive truman	03/07/2021 20:33:05	PETITNOBJ E	<p>Dear Enya Fogarty</p> <p>Old Hall Lodge Kidderpore Gardens London NW3 7SR 2021/2146/P: Ground floor rear and side extension including a roof-light. First floor bay window reconfiguration to rear. New entrance door to front elevation. Extension of main roof including front, rear and side dormer windows.</p> <p>1. We are the owner and occupiers of Old Hall cottage 4b Kidderpore Avenue. This comprises the main house and a separate lower ground floor flat in the adjoining building to the south of the application site.</p> <p>Graphical user interface, diagram, application</p> <p>Description automatically generated</p> <p>2. We strongly object to the proposed rear extension (identified in red above) which will overshadow and over-dominate the lower side window of No 4b, which lights a living room.</p> <p>3. A set of comparison plans and elevations that explain the objection are attached.</p> <p>4. The first shows the plan of Old Hall Lodge. The north elevation of No 4 is the hatched rectangle at the top of the sheet. It shows that the two dwellings are staggered, with the rear of Old Hall lodge where the extensions are proposed being about halfway along the north side of No 4b</p> <p>image009.jpg</p> <p>5. The No 4b existing and Old Hall Lodge's proposed adjacent side elevations are shown below in the relationship shown on the plan above. It is necessary to invert Old Hall Lodge's current application to get proper sense of the relationship between the two dwellings. The proposal is red-lined.</p> <p>image010.png No. 4b (side elevation) image011.pngimage012.pngimage013.png Timber cladding replacement bay at first floor level and the ground floor extension</p> <p>6. Note that the two dwellings are only about 1m apart at this point. The lower of the two side windows lighting Flat 4b is below front ground floor level and the other is at ground level with an outlook past Old Hall Lodge's rear elevation.</p> <p>7. The proposed rear extension is in front of both windows. The only daylight they receive is from the north behind Old Hall Lodge's existing rear elevation. This will be blocked for both windows by the proposed extension, which will cause a serious loss of daylight to both as well as a loss of outlook from the upper window.</p> <p>8. The proposal unacceptably affects their amenity and should be refused.</p> <p>9. It is also harmful to the Redington Frognaal Conservation Area because of its appearance. The proposed flat roofed, full width plus wrap around, timber cladding / render extension, with full height glazing would represent an unsympathetic addition to the building which would harm the heritage and townscape</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				merits of the building.
				10. In addition, the reconfiguration of the first-floor rear bay window is also harmful as its replacement is over dominant with inappropriate materials which would detract from the form and style of the building.
				11. It is also important to note, both the rear and side (north) dormers are inconsistent with the Council's Home Improvements CPG which requires consideration of the hierarchy of window openings which should result in smaller dormer windows than the ones at lower levels.
				Sincerely
				Clive and Susan Truman

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2146/P	Clive truman	03/07/2021 20:33:03	PETITNOBJ E	<p>Dear Enya Fogarty</p> <p>Old Hall Lodge Kidderpore Gardens London NW3 7SR 2021/2146/P: Ground floor rear and side extension including a roof-light. First floor bay window reconfiguration to rear. New entrance door to front elevation. Extension of main roof including front, rear and side dormer windows.</p> <p>1. We are the owner and occupiers of Old Hall cottage 4b Kidderpore Avenue. This comprises the main house and a separate lower ground floor flat in the adjoining building to the south of the application site.</p> <p>Graphical user interface, diagram, application</p> <p>Description automatically generated</p> <p>2. We strongly object to the proposed rear extension (identified in red above) which will overshadow and over-dominate the lower side window of No 4b, which lights a living room.</p> <p>3. A set of comparison plans and elevations that explain the objection are attached.</p> <p>4. The first shows the plan of Old Hall Lodge. The north elevation of No 4 is the hatched rectangle at the top of the sheet. It shows that the two dwellings are staggered, with the rear of Old Hall lodge where the extensions are proposed being about halfway along the north side of No 4b</p> <p>image009.jpg</p> <p>5. The No 4b existing and Old Hall Lodge's proposed adjacent side elevations are shown below in the relationship shown on the plan above. It is necessary to invert Old Hall Lodge's current application to get proper sense of the relationship between the two dwellings. The proposal is red-lined.</p> <p>image010.png No. 4b (side elevation) image011.pngimage012.pngimage013.png Timber cladding replacement bay at first floor level and the ground floor extension</p> <p>6. Note that the two dwellings are only about 1m apart at this point. The lower of the two side windows lighting Flat 4b is below front ground floor level and the other is at ground level with an outlook past Old Hall Lodge's rear elevation.</p> <p>7. The proposed rear extension is in front of both windows. The only daylight they receive is from the north behind Old Hall Lodge's existing rear elevation. This will be blocked for both windows by the proposed extension, which will cause a serious loss of daylight to both as well as a loss of outlook from the upper window.</p> <p>8. The proposal unacceptably affects their amenity and should be refused.</p> <p>9. It is also harmful to the Redington Frogna Conservation Area because of its appearance. The proposed flat roofed, full width plus wrap around, timber cladding / render extension, with full height glazing would represent an unsympathetic addition to the building which would harm the heritage and townscape</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				merits of the building.
				10. In addition, the reconfiguration of the first-floor rear bay window is also harmful as its replacement is over dominant with inappropriate materials which would detract from the form and style of the building.
				11. It is also important to note, both the rear and side (north) dormers are inconsistent with the Council's Home Improvements CPG which requires consideration of the hierarchy of window openings which should result in smaller dormer windows than the ones at lower levels.
				Sincerely
				Clive and Susan Truman

---



Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2146/P	Clive truman	04/07/2021 20:13:34	OBJ	<p>Old Hall Lodge Kidderpore Gardens London NW3 7SR</p> <p>2021/2146/P: Ground floor rear and side extension including a roof-light. First floor bay window reconfiguration to rear. New entrance door to front elevation. Extension of main roof including front, rear and side dormer windows.</p> <p>1. We are the owner and occupiers of Old Hall cottage 4b Kidderpore Avenue. This comprises the main house and a separate lower ground floor flat in the adjoining building to the south of the application site.</p> <p>Graphical user interface, diagram, application</p> <p>Description automatically generated</p> <p>2. We strongly object to the proposed rear extension (identified in red above) which will overshadow and over-dominate the lower side window of No 4b, which lights a living room.</p> <p>3. A set of comparison plans and elevations that explain the objection are attached.</p> <p>4. The first shows the plan of Old Hall Lodge. The north elevation of No 4 is the hatched rectangle at the top of the sheet. It shows that the two dwellings are staggered, with the rear of Old Hall lodge where the extensions are proposed being about halfway along the north side of No 4b</p> <p>image009.jpg</p> <p>5. The No 4b existing and Old Hall Lodge's proposed adjacent side elevations are shown below in the relationship shown on the plan above. It is necessary to invert Old Hall Lodge's current application to get proper sense of the relationship between the two dwellings. The proposal is red-lined.</p> <p>image010.png</p> <p>No. 4b (side elevation)</p> <p>image011.pngimage012.pngimage013.png</p> <p>Timber cladding replacement bay at first floor level and the ground floor extension</p> <p>6. Note that the two dwellings are only about 1m apart at this point. The lower of the two side windows lighting Flat 4b is below front ground floor level and the other is at ground level with an outlook past Old Hall Lodge's rear elevation.</p> <p>7. The proposed rear extension is in front of both windows. The only daylight they receive is from the north behind Old Hall Lodge's existing rear elevation. This will be blocked for both windows by the proposed extension, which will cause a serious loss of daylight to both as well as a loss of outlook from the upper window.</p> <p>8. The proposal unacceptably affects their amenity and should be refused.</p> <p>9. It is also harmful to the Redington Frognal Conservation Area because of its appearance. The proposed flat roofed, full width plus wrap around, timber cladding / render extension, with full height glazing would represent an unsympathetic addition to the building which would harm the heritage and townscape merits of the building.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>10. In addition, the reconfiguration of the first-floor rear bay window is also harmful as its replacement is over dominant with inappropriate materials which would detract from the form and style of the building.</p> <p>11. It is also important to note, both the rear and side (north) dormers are inconsistent with the Council's Home Improvements CPG which requires consideration of the hierarchy of window openings which should result in smaller dormer windows than the ones at lower levels.</p> <p>Sincerely</p> <p>Clive and Susan Truman</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2146/P	Clive truman	04/07/2021 20:13:27	OBJ	<p>Old Hall Lodge Kidderpore Gardens London NW3 7SR 2021/2146/P: Ground floor rear and side extension including a roof-light. First floor bay window reconfiguration to rear. New entrance door to front elevation. Extension of main roof including front, rear and side dormer windows.</p> <p>1. We are the owner and occupiers of Old Hall cottage 4b Kidderpore Avenue. This comprises the main house and a separate lower ground floor flat in the adjoining building to the south of the application site.</p> <p>Graphical user interface, diagram, application</p> <p>Description automatically generated</p> <p>2. We strongly object to the proposed rear extension (identified in red above) which will overshadow and over-dominate the lower side window of No 4b, which lights a living room.</p> <p>3. A set of comparison plans and elevations that explain the objection are attached.</p> <p>4. The first shows the plan of Old Hall Lodge. The north elevation of No 4 is the hatched rectangle at the top of the sheet. It shows that the two dwellings are staggered, with the rear of Old Hall lodge where the extensions are proposed being about halfway along the north side of No 4b</p> <p>image009.jpg</p> <p>5. The No 4b existing and Old Hall Lodge's proposed adjacent side elevations are shown below in the relationship shown on the plan above. It is necessary to invert Old Hall Lodge's current application to get proper sense of the relationship between the two dwellings. The proposal is red-lined.</p> <p>image010.png No. 4b (side elevation) image011.pngimage012.pngimage013.png Timber cladding replacement bay at first floor level and the ground floor extension</p> <p>6. Note that the two dwellings are only about 1m apart at this point. The lower of the two side windows lighting Flat 4b is below front ground floor level and the other is at ground level with an outlook past Old Hall Lodge's rear elevation.</p> <p>7. The proposed rear extension is in front of both windows. The only daylight they receive is from the north behind Old Hall Lodge's existing rear elevation. This will be blocked for both windows by the proposed extension, which will cause a serious loss of daylight to both as well as a loss of outlook from the upper window.</p> <p>8. The proposal unacceptably affects their amenity and should be refused.</p> <p>9. It is also harmful to the Redington Frognal Conservation Area because of its appearance. The proposed flat roofed, full width plus wrap around, timber cladding / render extension, with full height glazing would represent an unsympathetic addition to the building which would harm the heritage and townscape merits of the building.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>10. In addition, the reconfiguration of the first-floor rear bay window is also harmful as its replacement is over dominant with inappropriate materials which would detract from the form and style of the building.</p> <p>11. It is also important to note, both the rear and side (north) dormers are inconsistent with the Council's Home Improvements CPG which requires consideration of the hierarchy of window openings which should result in smaller dormer windows than the ones at lower levels.</p> <p>Sincerely</p> <p>Clive and Susan Truman</p>

---