

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1536/P	Broomberg	20/06/2022 13:24:54	COMMNT	The proposed extension is incompatible with the rest of the building and will interfere with the communal garden.
2022/1536/P	Esme Solnick	20/06/2022 15:42:07	OBJ	<p>This proposed extension is going to seriously impact on me. I live next door at number 2 and I am involved in overseeing the care of the garden and I use the garden everyday.</p> <p>The plan is to raise the party wall between our properties, almost 6 feet, which is hugely imposing on my little terrace and on my light on that side, where I have beautiful roses and creepers. This extension is excessive and an eyesore compared to the current conservatory. It will change the look of the garden aspect of the building. The raised skylight is imposing and ugly, and I would be devastated if this goes ahead.</p>
2022/1536/P	Michael JG Farthing	17/06/2022 11:35:14	OBJ	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION 2022/1536/P</p> <p>RESPONSE FROM: Flat 5, Maxwell Court, 67 Eton Avenue NW3 3EY</p> <p>OBJECTION:</p> <p>Dimensions (length and height) of the rear extension are excessive. There are design features which are not sympathetic to a building of this age in a conservation area. Some of the materials proposed are inappropriate.</p> <p>This final design proposal was not the one presented to the other residents at the meeting referred to in the application.</p> <p>The garden is shared by all owners of 67 Eton Avenue and the external appearance of the extension is therefore critical.</p> <p>SPECIFIC DETAILED OBJECTIONS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The external appearance is insensitive and inappropriate to the existing architecture of this 19th century Arts and Crafts house in a conservation area. 2. The overall height and stepped roof of the extension is excessive and unattractive. 3. The design of the coated aluminium windows is out of keeping with the house. The size, shape and positioning of these windows is discordant with all other windows on the south elevation of the house and gives the extension an almost industrial appearance. 4. Further information should be provided on the tiling materials proposed on the east side of the extension, on the drainage arrangements for the flat roof and the positioning of any ventilation/extractor ducting from the kitchen which is immediately below our apartment. <p>Alison McLean and Michael Farthing, Co-owners of Flat 5, Maxwell Court, 67 Eton Avenue.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1536/P	Hazel Crossick	17/06/2022 13:09:20	OBJ	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION 2022/1536/P</p> <p>RESPONSE FROM: Flat 7, Maxwell Court, 67 Eton Avenue NW3 3EY</p> <p>OBJECTION: This final design proposal was not the one presented to the other residents at the meeting referred to in the application.</p> <p>The garden is shared by all owners of 67 Eton Avenue and so the external appearance of the extension is visible from all points of the garden and appears to be unsympathetic to the general appearance of the building, which was built in the late 1800s and is in a conservation area (19th century Arts and Crafts house).</p> <p>Dimensions of the rear extension are significantly larger than the current footprint and the materials suggested are not in keeping with the rest of the building. In particular, the windows where the size, positioning and aluminium coated frame are completely out of keeping with the rest of the house.</p> <p>I therefore formally object to the final plans now on view.</p>
2022/1536/P	Broomberg	20/06/2022 13:24:50	COMMNT	<p>The proposed extension is incompatible with the rest of the building and will interfere with the communal garden.</p>