Argles James

From: Planning Support
Subject: FW: Comment Received from Public Access

Application Reference No. : HGY/2015/3094
Site Address: Flat 1 54 Church Crescent London N10 3NE
Comments by: Miss Gillian Nash
From:
56a
Church Crescent

Muswell Hill
London
N10 3NE
Submission: Objection
Comments: Having seen the comments by Stephen Anchor of 56b Church Crescent I am in full agreement with its contents. I was consulted by Mr Peter Miller before he submitted his application but at the time there was no reference to a 1st Floor roof terrace which will be intrusive, will destroy the privacy of my secluded garden, is likely to increase noise levels and is wholly inappropriate for this location as it is not within the main external walls of the originally built structure, located as it is proposed on the single storey ground floor extension. As such this was a misrepresentation of the proposal. Please note that the terrace on the top floor of No 54 is within the external walls of the originally built structure and is located on the top floor and as such is not intrusive. Furthermore it would seem to me that the roof terrace should not be part of this planning application since the proposed beneficiary, in the unlikely event that you should permit its creation, would be a different party from the one who is applying for the extension.
Regarding the extension itself, whereas I would have no objection in principle to small ground floor building extensions (with no roof terraces) the fact that the ground level of No 54 is approx. 1 metre higher than No 56 makes the visual impression of the structure more overbearing and thereby visually unattractive. There is a further issue in that the external wall of the extension between the boundary with No 56 is so close as to be physically impossible to construct or repair without encroaching on the land which is jointly owned by me (as ground leaseholder) and the party who owns the freehold reversion and there are no legal rights to enter on this land. Should permission for an extension be granted I would suggest there should be 1 metre width between the boundary and the external wall of the extension to facilitate construction and ongoing repair.
In the planning application design and access statement reference is made to the rebuilding of a conservatory for which permission was granted in 1984. This was not an extension to the original structure but, like the balcony for which permission was granted in 1987 was located on the top floor and within the external walls of the original structure. Thus there is no precedent for external extensions which add to the footprint of the original structure albeit that I do accept that a ground floor extension was built at No 52. Please note that this extension at No 52 was divided from No 54 by a side passageway, thereby reducing its impact on No 54 and was located on land which is lower than the land at No 50. Thus the affect of the massing on the adjoining properties was much less significant than will be the impact on No 56 from any proposals to extend No 54.
In conclusion I object most vehemently to the proposal to create a roof terrace serving the 1st floor flat, particularly given the proposed size and height above ground. I further object to the height of the extension (massing) caused by the differential in ground levels between No 54 and No 56 and I further object to the proximity of the external wall to the boundary between No 54 and No 56.