

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2021/6049/P	J Attlee	17/03/2022 23:57:22	COMMNT	Access to garage and gate at end of mews needed at all times

---

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2021/6049/P	Barbara Pedley and Graham Dunn	17/03/2022 12:43:11	OBJ	Planning application – 2021/6049/P Site Address 22 Lawn Rd NW3 2XR

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 garage conversion and rear extension would be. We have a series of questions to clarify this:

- Currently the garage at 22 Lawn Rd, and the raised tiled patio area above it, extend part-way across the garden to the external open stairwell between our properties. In the planning application the garage and patio are to be extended up to the boundary fence with our garden (Proposed Site Plan A(PL)001). This patio, reached by steps from the decking area next to the house, is already significantly raised above the original level of their garden (Appendix C CGL Basement Impact Assessment; Existing section A-A EX(PL)401; Proposed Section A-A A(PL)401). If the garage is extended to join our property, their patio would be approx. 1 metre above our sunken garden and result in loss of amenity, with the potential for overlooking, loss of privacy, and a feeling of enclosure. We would therefore like confirmation that the fence between our gardens will be kept at the minimum height possible while still retaining privacy (maximum 2 - 2.1m as measured from the bottom of our garden fence).

In addition, it is unclear from the application whether the height of this raised patio above the garage would be increased still further. The Proposed Works, P9 Design and Access Statement, states that they will 'Raise part of the patio level by 350mm to match internal floor level' of the new extension, while the Proposal non-specifically states 'raising of garden floor level'. Proposed Section A-A A(PL)401 indicates that only the decking area next to the house, and not the paved patio above the garage, will be raised, while Proposed Rear Elevation A (PL)501 appears to show a general raised 'Proposed Garden Level.'

Will they please confirm that the rear paved area above the garage will not be raised any further above its current level? We would strongly object to this, as it would require a higher fence and produce an even greater loss of amenity by furthering the sense of enclosure, and increasing the prospect of overlooking and loss of privacy.

- Any party wall/fence between our two gardens must be agreed with us in terms of style and height. This should be at the regulation height for back gardens, with a maximum of 2-2.1 metres from the base of our current fence.

- There is no apparent tree report in the package of documents provided. The only mention is in Section 9 (Trees and Hedges) of the Application Form, where they have answered 'NO' to the question 'Are there any trees or hedges on your own property or on adjoining properties which are within falling distance of your proposed development?'

However, we do have a mature, very large and healthy ash tree (approx. 11m high) growing at the bottom left of our back garden, within 1 metre of the proposed excavation site for the garage extension. This forms part of a row of old ash trees that runs along the back gardens on the south side of Lawn Rd. We believe this tree is protected by the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area. I have consulted a tree surgeon (Oakhouse Arboricultural Services Ltd), who says there is an extremely high chance that any building works this close to the tree will damage the root system, resulting in instability and severe damage and/or death of the tree. We strongly request confirmation that a detailed investigation will take place before building work

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

commences, to confirm that the tree will not be damaged in any way. We also insist that indemnity cover would be taken out by the owners, so that they take responsibility in case of any damage to property and/or people if the tree should be damaged or fall.

- We need constant access to our garage and side gate, which are adjacent and at right angles to the proposed garage extension, at the end of the mews (see Proposed Site Plan A(PL)001 and Existing Site Plan EX(PL)001). Is our garage entrance likely to get blocked during building works? If this is the case, an alternative garage would need to be provided by the owners. In the last 6 months we have twice had the catalytic converter stolen from our car while parked outside our house In Lawn Rd, so this is not a viable alternative.

The Planning Statement p13 states that the garage will be lowered by 1 m to increase existing space. Will there be any changes to the lane which will affect access to our garage post building works?

- The Belsize Tunnel, part of Midland Main Line railway, runs directly under our house and garden at a depth of only 8 metres (see Design and Access Statement p6; Appendix C CGL Basement Impact Assessment). This is currently the subject of improvement works by Network Rail (Railway Upgrade Plan: Belsize Tunnel and shafts). We strongly request that it is investigated fully before work commences, as any nearby excavations could cause instability in our property.

- The Design and Access Statement (P9) gives the height of the proposed rear extension, directly against our house, as 3 metres. However, it is unclear where the height of the proposed rear extension is measured from, because the application includes a proposal to raise the floor of the extension and adjacent decking by 350cm above the existing level (P9 of the Design and Access Statement; Proposed Section A-A A(PL)401). This means that the level on No 22's side of the boundary would be higher than the level on our side (No 21). 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 high, especially as the depth of the planned extension is also being significantly increased. We object if the height of the proposed rear extension is taken from this raised floor level, and if the new roof is more than 28cm higher than the existing rear extension when measured against the rear wall of the house.

- We object to the close proximity to our house of the side of the proposed rear extension (Design and Access Statement p20), the existing extension is 44cm from our house, but the planned extension would only be 15cm away. With reference to this, it appears that the side of the proposed extension is set back significantly further from No 23 Lawn Rd than from our house (Design and Access Statement p20). Combined with the increase in overall size of the extension, which is higher and deeper than the current extension, this would contribute to a great loss of amenity, producing a sense of enclosure and an overbearing and oppressive appearance, as seen from our adjacent kitchen, patio and sunken garden. We therefore strongly request that the planned extension should be set further back from our house and boundary.

---

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2021/6049/P	Barbara Pedley and Graham Dunn	17/03/2022 12:43:08	OBJ	Planning application – 2021/6049/P Site Address 22 Lawn Rd NW3 2XR

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 garage conversion and rear extension would be. We have a series of questions to clarify this:

- Currently the garage at 22 Lawn Rd, and the raised tiled patio area above it, extend part-way across the garden to the external open stairwell between our properties. In the planning application the garage and patio are to be extended up to the boundary fence with our garden (Proposed Site Plan A(PL)001). This patio, reached by steps from the decking area next to the house, is already significantly raised above the original level of their garden (Appendix C CGL Basement Impact Assessment; Existing section A-A EX(PL)401; Proposed Section A-A A(PL)401). If the garage is extended to join our property, their patio would be approx. 1 metre above our sunken garden and result in loss of amenity, with the potential for overlooking, loss of privacy, and a feeling of enclosure. We would therefore like confirmation that the fence between our gardens will be kept at the minimum height possible while still retaining privacy (maximum 2 - 2.1m as measured from the bottom of our garden fence).

In addition, it is unclear from the application whether the height of this raised patio above the garage would be increased still further. The Proposed Works, P9 Design and Access Statement, states that they will 'Raise part of the patio level by 350mm to match internal floor level' of the new extension, while the Proposal non-specifically states 'raising of garden floor level'. Proposed Section A-A A(PL)401 indicates that only the decking area next to the house, and not the paved patio above the garage, will be raised, while Proposed Rear Elevation A (PL)501 appears to show a general raised 'Proposed Garden Level.'

Will they please confirm that the rear paved area above the garage will not be raised any further above its current level? We would strongly object to this, as it would require a higher fence and produce an even greater loss of amenity by furthering the sense of enclosure, and increasing the prospect of overlooking and loss of privacy.

- Any party wall/fence between our two gardens must be agreed with us in terms of style and height. This should be at the regulation height for back gardens, with a maximum of 2-2.1 metres from the base of our current fence.

- There is no apparent tree report in the package of documents provided. The only mention is in Section 9 (Trees and Hedges) of the Application Form, where they have answered 'NO' to the question 'Are there any trees or hedges on your own property or on adjoining properties which are within falling distance of your proposed development?'

However, we do have a mature, very large and healthy ash tree (approx. 11m high) growing at the bottom left of our back garden, within 1 metre of the proposed excavation site for the garage extension. This forms part of a row of old ash trees that runs along the back gardens on the south side of Lawn Rd. We believe this tree is protected by the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area. I have consulted a tree surgeon (Oakhouse Arboricultural Services Ltd), who says there is an extremely high chance that any building works this close to the tree will damage the root system, resulting in instability and severe damage and/or death of the tree. We strongly request confirmation that a detailed investigation will take place before building work

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

commences, to confirm that the tree will not be damaged in any way. We also insist that indemnity cover would be taken out by the owners, so that they take responsibility in case of any damage to property and/or people if the tree should be damaged or fall.

- We need constant access to our garage and side gate, which are adjacent and at right angles to the proposed garage extension, at the end of the mews (see Proposed Site Plan A(PL)001 and Existing Site Plan EX(PL)001). Is our garage entrance likely to get blocked during building works? If this is the case, an alternative garage would need to be provided by the owners. In the last 6 months we have twice had the catalytic converter stolen from our car while parked outside our house In Lawn Rd, so this is not a viable alternative.

The Planning Statement p13 states that the garage will be lowered by 1 m to increase existing space. Will there be any changes to the lane which will affect access to our garage post building works?

- The Belsize Tunnel, part of Midland Main Line railway, runs directly under our house and garden at a depth of only 8 metres (see Design and Access Statement p6; Appendix C CGL Basement Impact Assessment). This is currently the subject of improvement works by Network Rail (Railway Upgrade Plan: Belsize Tunnel and shafts). We strongly request that it is investigated fully before work commences, as any nearby excavations could cause instability in our property.

- The Design and Access Statement (P9) gives the height of the proposed rear extension, directly against our house, as 3 metres. However, it is unclear where the height of the proposed rear extension is measured from, because the application includes a proposal to raise the floor of the extension and adjacent decking by 350cm above the existing level (P9 of the Design and Access Statement; Proposed Section A-A A(PL)401). This means that the level on No 22's side of the boundary would be higher than the level on our side (No 21). 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 high, especially as the depth of the planned extension is also being significantly increased. We object if the height of the proposed rear extension is taken from this raised floor level, and if the new roof is more than 28cm higher than the existing rear extension when measured against the rear wall of the house.

- We object to the close proximity to our house of the side of the proposed rear extension (Design and Access Statement p20), the existing extension is 44cm from our house, but the planned extension would only be 15cm away. With reference to this, it appears that the side of the proposed extension is set back significantly further from No 23 Lawn Rd than from our house (Design and Access Statement p20). Combined with the increase in overall size of the extension, which is higher and deeper than the current extension, this would contribute to a great loss of amenity, producing a sense of enclosure and an overbearing and oppressive appearance, as seen from our adjacent kitchen, patio and sunken garden. We therefore strongly request that the planned extension should be set further back from our house and boundary.