

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/4953/P	Dr Barbara Pedley	19/12/2021 12:19:39	OBJ	<p>Planning application – 2021/4953/P Site Address 22 Lawn Rd NW3 2XR</p>

We are the owners and occupiers of 21 Lawn Road, the adjacent property to 22 Lawn Road. We object to the planning application, in part because of lack of adequate information in the submission documents, which makes it hard for us to know for certain what the scale and impact of the rear extension will be. We have a series of questions to clarify this:

- The Design and Access statement (page 9) gives the height of the proposed rear extension as 3 metres. However, it does not state from where the height is being measured. This is important because the application includes a proposal to raise the floor level of the extension and adjacent patio from which it is being built, so that the level on No 22's side of the boundary will be higher than the level on our side (No 21). Thus the roof of the new rear extension would be much more than 3m higher than our patio level, adjacent to our house.

Proposed Plans A(PL)401 and A(PL) 501 do not show the height of the existing rear extension, which is less than 3m, in relation to the proposed rear extension. The existing height should be indicated by a red line, as used in A(PL)010 to indicate changes in the length and depth of the existing rear extension in relation to the planned extension. This would clarify the planned increase in rear extension height proposed on our boundary.

We object if the height of the proposed rear extension is more than 20cm higher, when measured against the rear wall of the house, than the height of the existing rear extension.

Specifically, it is currently unclear whether the height of the proposed rear extension, which would be right up against our boundary, is measured from the existing ground level, or from the proposed floor level of the new extension and adjacent patio. If the latter, this floor level would be approximately 350mm higher than the existing extension and patio, as stated in the Proposed Works p9 of the Design and Access Statement, and shown by a red line in the Proposed Plan A(PL)401. If the 3m is measured from this new, raised level it would result in a significantly higher extension roof height right on our boundary. This would be overbearing compared with the existing extension, which is less than 3m.

We object to the side of the proposed new rear extension being so close to the boundary line, as this would contribute to an overbearing appearance from our property, and suggest that it should be set back further from the boundary than is shown in the application.

With regard to loss of amenity, this increase in height would produce an increase in the sense of enclosure as seen from our adjacent kitchen, patio and sunken garden.

- We would like the applicants to confirm that the boundary fence comes all the way up to the rear of our house as it does currently. However, in Proposed Section A-A A(PL)401 it appears to only run up to the outer edge of the new rear extension.
- Any party wall fence/wall between the two gardens must be agreed with us in terms of style and height, and should be under 2 metres from natural ground level on our side. The boundary wall/fence in the figure on

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

page 9 of the Planning Application appears much higher than this when compared with the 3m extension, and would be even higher when viewed from our garden, which is at a lower level.

- What is the height of the white rendered wall on the rear, side and back boundaries - p10 of the design and Access Statement of the Planning Application? The application should confirm that the overall total height of wall and fence above will not exceed 2 metres from our garden level.
-

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/4953/P	Dr Barbara Pedley	19/12/2021 22:55:18	OBJ	<p>Planning application – 2021/4953/P Site Address 22 Lawn Rd NW3 2XR</p>

We are the owners and occupiers of 21 Lawn Road, the adjacent property to 22 Lawn Road. We object to the planning application, in part because of lack of adequate information in the submission documents, which makes it hard for us to know for certain what the scale and impact of the rear extension will be. We have a series of questions to clarify this:

- The Design and Access statement (page 9) gives the height of the proposed rear extension as 3 metres. However, it does not state from where the height is being measured. This is important because the application includes a proposal to raise the floor level of the extension and adjacent patio from which it is being built, so that the level on No 22's side of the boundary will be higher than the level on our side (No 21). Thus the roof of the new rear extension would be much more than 3m higher than our patio level, adjacent to our house.

Proposed Plans A(PL)401 and A(PL) 501 do not show the height of the existing rear extension, which is less than 3m, in relation to the proposed rear extension. The existing height should be indicated by a red line, as used in A(PL)010 to indicate how the length and depth of the existing rear extension would be increased in the planned extension. This would clarify the planned increase in rear extension height proposed on our boundary.

We object if the height of the proposed rear extension is more than 20cm higher, when measured against the rear wall of the house, than the height of the existing rear extension.

Specifically, it is currently unclear whether the height of the proposed rear extension, which would be right up against our boundary, is measured from the existing ground level, or from the proposed floor level of the new extension and adjacent patio. If the latter, this floor level would be approximately 350mm higher than the existing extension and patio, as stated in the Proposed Works p9 of the Design and Access Statement, and shown by a red line in the Proposed Plan A(PL)401. If the 3m is measured from this new, raised level it would result in a significantly higher extension roof height right on our boundary. This would be overbearing compared with the existing extension, which is less than 3m, especially as the depth of the planned extension is also being increased.

We object to the side of the proposed new rear extension being so close to the boundary line, as this would contribute to an overbearing appearance from our property, and suggest that it should be set back further from the boundary than is shown in the application.

With regard to loss of amenity, this increase in height would produce an increase in the sense of enclosure as seen from our adjacent kitchen, patio and sunken garden.

- We would like the applicants to confirm that the boundary fence comes all the way up to the rear of our house as it does currently. However, in Proposed Section A-A A(PL)401 it appears to only run up to the outer edge of the new rear extension.
- Any party wall fence/wall between the two gardens must be agreed with us in terms of style and height,

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

and should be under 2 metres from natural ground level on our side. The boundary wall/fence in the figure on page 9 of the Planning Application appears much higher than this when compared with the 3m extension, and would be even higher when viewed from our garden, which is at a lower level.

- What is the height of the white rendered wall on the rear, side and back boundaries - p10 of the design and Access Statement of the Planning Application? The application should confirm that the overall total height of wall and fence above will not exceed 2 metres from our garden level.
-

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/4953/P	Dr Barbara Pedley	19/12/2021 12:19:40	OBJ	<p>Planning application – 2021/4953/P Site Address 22 Lawn Rd NW3 2XR</p>

We are the owners and occupiers of 21 Lawn Road, the adjacent property to 22 Lawn Road. We object to the planning application, in part because of lack of adequate information in the submission documents, which makes it hard for us to know for certain what the scale and impact of the rear extension will be. We have a series of questions to clarify this:

- The Design and Access statement (page 9) gives the height of the proposed rear extension as 3 metres. However, it does not state from where the height is being measured. This is important because the application includes a proposal to raise the floor level of the extension and adjacent patio from which it is being built, so that the level on No 22's side of the boundary will be higher than the level on our side (No 21). Thus the roof of the new rear extension would be much more than 3m higher than our patio level, adjacent to our house.

Proposed Plans A(PL)401 and A(PL) 501 do not show the height of the existing rear extension, which is less than 3m, in relation to the proposed rear extension. The existing height should be indicated by a red line, as used in A(PL)010 to indicate changes in the length and depth of the existing rear extension in relation to the planned extension. This would clarify the planned increase in rear extension height proposed on our boundary.

We object if the height of the proposed rear extension is more than 20cm higher, when measured against the rear wall of the house, than the height of the existing rear extension.

Specifically, it is currently unclear whether the height of the proposed rear extension, which would be right up against our boundary, is measured from the existing ground level, or from the proposed floor level of the new extension and adjacent patio. If the latter, this floor level would be approximately 350mm higher than the existing extension and patio, as stated in the Proposed Works p9 of the Design and Access Statement, and shown by a red line in the Proposed Plan A(PL)401. If the 3m is measured from this new, raised level it would result in a significantly higher extension roof height right on our boundary. This would be overbearing compared with the existing extension, which is less than 3m.

We object to the side of the proposed new rear extension being so close to the boundary line, as this would contribute to an overbearing appearance from our property, and suggest that it should be set back further from the boundary than is shown in the application.

With regard to loss of amenity, this increase in height would produce an increase in the sense of enclosure as seen from our adjacent kitchen, patio and sunken garden.

- We would like the applicants to confirm that the boundary fence comes all the way up to the rear of our house as it does currently. However, in Proposed Section A-A A(PL)401 it appears to only run up to the outer edge of the new rear extension.
- Any party wall fence/wall between the two gardens must be agreed with us in terms of style and height, and should be under 2 metres from natural ground level on our side. The boundary wall/fence in the figure on

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

page 9 of the Planning Application appears much higher than this when compared with the 3m extension, and would be even higher when viewed from our garden, which is at a lower level.

- What is the height of the white rendered wall on the rear, side and back boundaries - p10 of the design and Access Statement of the Planning Application? The application should confirm that the overall total height of wall and fence above will not exceed 2 metres from our garden level.
-