

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/5187/P	Anna Halford	17/12/2021 16:44:11	OBJ	<p>Objection to digging down for the back ground floor extension. The plans indicate an intention to dig down in the back. The house foundations on this street are shallow (shallower than pictured in the side elevation drawings). Digging down, or lowering the foundations is likely to cause damp for neighbouring houses (including our house which is directly next to the property, up the hill), subsidence, issues with water flow down the hill, and drainage problems. Most significantly, we have concerns about structural integrity of the terrace if digging down, as there is already subsidence due to the position of the houses on the hill terrace and existing building movement due to proximity to the railway.</p> <p>Objection to the raised ceiling on the first floor back extension. The plans are not entirely clear on this point, but we understand that there is an intention to raise the flat roof to allow for an extended ceiling height of 2.8m (raising the height up to the level of the shared ridge between the rooves of the 1st floor back extension. This would require the removal of a shared chimney stack (or compromise structural integrity). This is not clearly shown on the plans.</p> <p>Objection to the loft conversion because the plans are incomplete on this point. The current plans show no back dormer window and no staircase. It is unclear how a staircase could be constructed with headroom based on the current planning. We understand from neighbours that a back dormer is in fact envisaged, but is not included in the plans. We are concerned to see these, to ensure that it does not create structural or drainage issues for adjoining buildings, including our property.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/5187/P	Jennie Norwood	17/12/2021 17:35:13	OBJNOT	<p>I am objecting to various aspects of the planning application 2021/5187/P on the terraced house at No 43 Ravenshaw Street next door to my property at No 45.</p> <p>Planning consent has been sought for (1) a dormer on the front roof slope; (2) extension of the ground floor closet wing to the boundary wall; (3) the pitched roof on the closet wing to be a flat roof and to be increased in height and (4) to lower the floor of the rear closet wing. In addition, the applicant intends to install a dormer on the rear roof space under permitted development rules but this is not indicated on these plans.</p> <p>As a general comment I do not think that the plans are in any way detailed enough; there is no narrative to describe the applicant's intentions or the materials to be used. Paragraph D.7.4 of the Local Plan requires that a Design and Access Statement should assess how the development has been informed and it should respond to local context and character. The creation of a flat roof on the closet wing and the installation of a dormer on the front of the property does not respond to local context and character.</p> <p>I would have thought that a planning application should encompass all proposed development (whether permission is required or not) to ensure that the extent of the works can be understood by all parties and which will allow the planners to make an informed decision.</p> <p>By way of background, Ravenshaw Street slopes considerably from top to bottom and the topography means that our house at No 45 is half a metre lower than the adjoining property at No 43. This is shown on the plans provided by the applicant.</p> <p>Ground floor extension at rear & height of boundary wall The submitted plans show the rear outrigger being extended to the boundary wall & this in itself is not contentious. However, I have reservations about the height of the proposed boundary wall in the context of the topography of the street. My house is lower than No 43 by just under half a m</p>
2021/5187/P	Michael Simkins	18/12/2021 21:42:09	OBJ	<p>I wish to object to certain aspects this of this proposal. The proposed Front Dormer Roof Space is utterly out of keeping with the aesthetic of that line of houses, and transgresses Camden Council's own statement that the impact on the street scene should be taken into account. There are no dormer windows in the line of nine houses of which 43 is a component - instead residents have opted for Velux windows (as have we at our house opposite, Number 36) , thus allowing light and sun into the top floor while not wrecking the aesthetic and overall lines of the street curve. It perfectly possible for a Velux to provide all the developer requires in terms of light and sun, a dormer meanwhile, as well as looking ugly, encroaches on the privacy of residents occupying top floors of other nearby dwellings. We would all like Dormer windows , but in purchasing a property in this particular street surely there has to be some respect and empathy for the overall look of the architecture and for the people who dwell here.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/5187/P	Mike McGill	18/12/2021 20:53:25	OBJ	<p>Dear Mr Wong,</p> <p>I write to object to planning application 2021/5187/P on the grounds of the visual harm that the proposed front dormer window would cause to the local street scene. I am a former design and conservation officer at Camden Council and so familiar with the architectural and historical development of West Hampstead and the local planning precedents on Ravenshaw Street. No 43 Ravenshaw Street forms part of a terrace of 10 houses (nos. 37 to 55) which were constructed in a single building phase in the year 1890. The terrace is characterised by identical red facing bricks, sash windows and shallow pitch sloping roofs. With the exception of no 55 at the terrace end, the terrace does not have any modern dormer windows installed to their original roof slopes. This is because the planning officers at Camden Council have continually resisted such proposals over two decades, because front facing dormers would be an incongruous and harmful visual addition to these small terrace houses, with their shallow roofs. Camden's planning officers have instead directed property owners to construct new dormers onto the rear roof slopes instead. A quick review of Google Earth imagery will show that there is an established precedent of rear dormers on the rear facing slopes along Ravenshaw St. Therefore, the applicant should be directed to do the same which will significantly increase the useable head space within the rear section of the existing loft space, while maintaining the uninterrupted visual harmony of the roof slopes, along this historic terrace. This revised proposal will go some way to meeting the councils' policies on new design / development integrating into their local contexts. On a related issue, I note that no loft-access staircase has been shown on the proposed plan drawing at roof level, so the current proposed design is not technically viable; and its design would not meet the requirements of the Building Regulations.</p> <p>I therefore kindly request that you seek to have the applicant revise these poorly considered proposals in order to meet the council's relevant design policies.</p>
2021/5187/P	Anna Halford	17/12/2021 16:36:18	COMMT	<p>Objection to digging down for the back ground floor extension. The plans indicate an intention to dig down in the back. The house foundations on this street are shallow (shallower than pictured in the side elevation drawings). Digging down, or lowering the foundations is likely to cause damp for neighbouring houses (including our house which is directly next to the property, up the hill), subsidence, issues with water flow down the hill, and drainage problems. Most significantly, we have concerns about structural integrity of the terrace if digging down, as there is already subsidence due to the position of the houses on the hill terrace and existing building movement due to proximity to the railway.</p> <p>Objection to the raised ceiling on the first floor back extension. The plans are not entirely clear on this point, but we understand that there is an intention to raise the flat roof to allow for an extended ceiling height of 2.8m (raising the height up to the level of the shared ridge between the rooves of the 1st floor back extension. This would require the removal of a shared chimney stack (or compromise structural integrity). This is not clearly shown on the plans.</p> <p>Objection to t loft conversion because the plans are incomplete on this point. The current plans show no back dormer window and no staircase. It is unclear how a staircase could be constructed with headroom based on the current planning. We understand from neighbours that a back dormer is in fact envisaged, but is not included in the plans. We are concerned to see these, to ensure that it does not create structural or drainage issues for adjoining buildings, including our property.</p>