

Comment on a planning application

Application Details

Application: 24/2399/HOT

Address: The Navigators House River Lane Petersham Richmond TW10 7AG

Proposal: Internal refurbishment, replacement of the existing conservatory with a new single storey rear extension and reconfiguration of modern bay structures.

Comments Made By

Name: Mr. Richard O'Hara

Address: Glen Cottage River Lane Petersham Richmond TW10 7AG

Comments

Type of comment: Object to the proposal

Comment: Further to the planning application submitted by the Navigator's House we would like to object to the application on issues relating to the design, the impact on residential amenity and the effect on the Mulberry and Magnolia trees that directly adjoin the proposed rear addition.

1. The height and length of the proposed rear extension is far larger than the existing conservatory and the previously proposed rear addition submitted in 2013.

The proposed rear extension would create an unacceptable additional enclosure on Glen Cottage both in height and length further exacerbating the existing visually intrusive impact on Glen Cottage by the historic successive extensions of the Navigator's House.

The proposed rear extension extends over 6m from the rear wall of the existing conservatory and would be built along on top of the party fence wall increasing in height by 1.3M over the party fence wall.

The proposed extension also extends beyond the existing main back addition building line, that is the current rear addition, by over 1m and does not follow the existing stepped line of the extension. This existing stepped footprint helps in minimising the sense of enclosure and visual intrusion on the neighbouring property Glen Cottage. The proposed new extension is tantamount to a planning creep along the party fence wall.

2. The Arboriculturalist report refers to a poplar tree, labelled 13 on the adjoining owner's side (Glen Cottage) of the party fence wall.

This tree is actually a white mulberry tree and adjoins the party fence wall right next to the proposed development. Its root system will inevitably be affected by the proposed extension however much care is taken to avoid this, as the additional footprint of the proposed extension will be directly over the root area.

3. The boundary line shown on the drawings appears to be in line with the inside face of the common boundary wall (Glen Cottage side) and not at the centre of the party fence wall.

This build up on the party fence wall adds to the overbearing impact and sense of enclosure on Glen Cottage.

This will further add to the visually intrusive impact as the proposed extension will not only sit on the boundary wall, but will be substantially increased in height and depth as mentioned above.

4. These historic buildings do not have adequate sound insulation to cater for modern day living and we would ask that appropriate soundproofing measures are taken wherever possible in proximity to the party wall.

5. These significant works will also require a great deal of time to carry out and we would ask that consideration is given to the use of heavy machinery during holidays and weekends and permissible site hours carefully considered to minimise disturbance. We also request that access to the drive at Glen Cottage is not blocked by the building works or vehicle

stacking along River Lane.

Notwithstanding the current application, the building owners have assured us that they will resubmit an alternative application taking into consideration all of our concerns to mitigate aspects of enclosure and address issues of soundproofing.