

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1323/P	CRASH	14/05/2022 10:18:24	OBJ	<p>This objection is submitted by CRASH (Combined Residents' Associations of South Hampstead) who note that the scheme is, basically, a rehash of Application 2021/5344/P of December 2021. CRASH withdrew its objection to that application having been given an assurance that the planned first floor extension would not be proceeded with. Our objections to 2021/5344/P apply equally to the current application submitted by the same architects.</p> <p>In addition, we note the following section in the Heritage Statement: "It was felt that the extensions at both Nos 64 &amp; 68 dominate the rear facade of the host buildings, therefore it (sic) a mansard type of roof extension was detailed to create a more sympathetic and subservient relationship with the principal building." CRASH is at a loss to understand how, if the extension at 64 DOMINATES the host building how a much taller extension at 66 is considered to be more subservient. Not only is the proposed extension taller than 64's but the design and the materials (zinc on the "mansard-type" roof and full-width powder-coated aluminium sliding windows) are incongruous and discordant on a mid-Victorian building. The statement also states that the extension will be screened from neighbouring properties by trees, but, of course, that will only apply for a fraction of the year when the trees are in full leaf.</p> <p>The Council is urged to refuse consent.</p>

---