

OBJECTORS LETTER

Please Index As

File Number

Part 1

Part 10

Part 2

Part 11

Part 3

Part 12

Part 4

Part 13

Part 5

Part 14

Part 6

Part 15

Part 7

Part 16

Part 8

Part 17

Part 9

Part 18

15

The Ladbroke Association

Please reply to

Robert Meadows
19 Stanley Crescent
W11 2NA

✓
LT
20/1/2000



Director of Planning Services
The Town Hall
Hornton Street
W8. 7NK

copy

15 January 2000

| RECEIVED BY PLANNING SERVICES | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|------------|------------|------------|--|
| EX DIR | HDC | C | SW | SE | ENF | AD- ACK | |
| 30 20 JAN 2000 | | | | | | | |
| | IO | REC | ARB | FWD PLN | CON DES | FEE | |

Dear Sir

At recent meetings of our committee we have discussed the Planning Applications currently before you regarding buildings in this Conservation Area. We would like to comment on some of them as follows.

18 Holland Park Avenue. We think that the nursery school consent should remain on a five year termly basis and should be personal.

32 Lansdowne Road. The design of the new pier-caps is too thin.

30 Arundel Gardens. The new back extension is out of character and would infringe the privacy of the neighbours. A window in the party wall is unacceptable.

129 Elgin Crescent. Character of new glazing? Effect on neighbours privacy?

20 Lansdowne Road. Scheme too grandiose, railings too high. Hard standing for car not acceptable.

77 Lansdowne Road. In recent years the roof line has been changed in an unfortunate way on this prominent corner house. There appears to be no reason for railings on the roof and they should be removed.

37 Ladbroke Square. Glazing to the back extension appears to be out of character and could affect the privacy of the neighbours.

27 Kensington Park Gardens. A large water tank on the roof appears to be quite unnecessary, under current water regulations.

107 Ladbroke Road. New conservatories already built. The drawings do not show the design adequately.

3 Ladbroke Terrace. The front of this house has been ruined by past alterations. Separate access to a carer's flat seems unnecessary and would add still more to the confusion of the front elevation.

over/

81j

29 Ladbroke Road. The front door canopy and the increase in the height of the back extension are both unacceptable.

82j

82 Ladbroke Road. It is very hard to judge the flamboyant drawings and design proposals ! The curvilinear design of back extension and garden could be very attractive. How will it affect the neighbours ? Hard standing for three cars seems excessive, with removal of three trees. 99/2564 (SW)

Yours faithfully

Robert Meadows