

Comment on a planning application

Application Details

Application: 24/2142/HOT

Address: 22 Park Drive East Sheen London SW14 8RD

Proposal: Loft conversion erection of dormer to the rear and addition of gambrel roof dormer to the rear roof addition with roof lights to the front roof. Erection of part single part two storey rear and side extension. Addition of basement to the property together with replacement of windows and doors through out the house.

Comments Made By

Name: Mrs. R Shone

Address: 24 Park Drive East Sheen London SW14 8RD

Comments

Type of comment: Object to the proposal

Comment: We strongly object to this application for 22 Park Drive, which we are attached to as a symmetrical pair.

We have engaged with the applicants' planning process now for over 4 years. We have indicated in our previous submission to LBRUT we would be supportive of a scheme reduced in scale, subordinate to the main structure – stepping back/down both projections and elevation, reducing the visual bulk of the side, rear first floor and loft extensions.

This application (submitted after earlier refused planning permission and an unsuccessful appeal) still does not mitigate our concerns. We feel it is poorly conceived - the revised plans still show a design which with its overall combined bulk and dominance, lack of subservience and subordination to the host dwelling, and incongruous form of development appears contrived only to maximise internal volume with insufficient regard to National and Local Planning policies and frameworks.

We have engaged the services of a planning consultant who has submitted a letter of objection on our behalf outlining in detail why the proposed revisions do not overcome the reasons for refusal upheld by the Planning Appeal Inspector.

Further we would like to draw your attention to inaccuracies within the application. These include but may not be limited to:

Householder Application Form

1. There is no reduction in Gross Internal Area to be added to the development shown in the latest Householder Application dated 22.8.2024 – both this document and the previous version dated 24.10.23 show this as 153 square metres
2. The response to the question dated 22.8.2024 re Preapplication advice – Details of the pre-application advice received states

'The proposed scheme is acceptable overall with some amendments to the design and scale.'

The summary of the preapplication advice 22-P0158-PREAPP 20.6.22 actually stated:

'Whilst there is no in-principal objection to a two storey rear extension, the proposed three storey extension and roof form are considered unacceptable and must be omitted in any formal submission. Any roof alterations will need to be designed to adhere to policy and guidance.'

Submitted Drawings

The drawings submitted with Application 24/2142/HOT are dated October 2023; confusingly this is also the date on the drawings for application 23/2877/HOT.

There are inaccuracies in the submitted drawings. This includes but may not be limited to Drawings 2023-HBP-13 and 2023-HBP-16 which do not correlate – e.g., the rear roof angles are not consistent in the drawings; the plan itself is not

consistent from rear to side elevation.

There remain omissions of detail which amongst others include e.g., roof drawings of the front elevation do not show any setback in the roofline for the proposed 150mm setback of first floor walls below, there is a lack of clarity/detail regarding how the proposed first floor and roof plans incorporate the parapet of the existing garage; lack of sufficient detail how the proposed dormer window could be achieved, etc.

We remain very concerned the design shows a lack of both understanding and sufficient detail which may ultimately impact actual construction, and most worryingly potentially show a design which cannot be realised without changes in the future.

We believe the proposed extensions in combination still represent a dominant, overbearing and unsympathetic form of overdevelopment, which is contrary to LP1 and the SPD.

The observations above, combined with the reasons set out in the report submitted on our behalf by our planning consultant, form the basis of our strong objection. We therefore respectfully request the Council refuse the application.