

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3137/P	Lillian Amuge	11/09/2023 17:05:24	OBJ	I would like to appeal the decision due to the fact that I am the next door neighbour and structurally I believe this will impact my home. In addition to that from a noise perspective this is not something I would like to accommodate as it will be extremely disturbing. I was made aware of this at the last moment by another neighbour who feels the same as I do. Please take my worries into consideration when reviewing this planning permission as I believe this will be detrimental to both my house and my already ill health (from an air and noise, quality perspective).
2023/3137/P	C.A	12/09/2023 00:01:42	COMMNT	The houses on this road have a history of Japanese knotweed which would/could have had an effect on the existing foundation. The works planned Would have an effect on properties surrounding especially if walls are connected.
2023/3137/P	C.A	12/09/2023 00:01:39	COMMNT	The houses on this road have a history of Japanese knotweed which would/could have had an effect on the existing foundation. The works planned Would have an effect on properties surrounding especially if walls are connected.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3137/P	Susannah Fitzherbert-Brockholes	10/09/2023 13:34:44	OBJ	FAO Leela Muthoora

Dear Ms. Muthoora,

2023/3137/P Erection of single storey rear infill extension following partial demolition of existing extension

We write to object to proposals at 204 Grafton Road (reference 2023/3137/P). We are immediate neighbours to 204 Grafton Road (we live at 206) and our objections are based on 1) the extension is not subservient to the main house, and 2) impact on our amenity.

1. The extension is not subservient to the main house: the rear gardens of this terrace are typified by a pattern of ground floor outriggers, some with roof terraces. These appear to be original, and over time a series of 'side return' style infill extensions (including ours, but also nos. 208, 210, 214 etc.) have infilled the remainder of the rear ground floor elevation. These extensions are always subservient to the original outrigger, usually with pitched roofs, presumably because this maintains the legibility of the terrace, stays subservient to the host building, and avoids affecting the amenity of neighbours. These infill / side-return extensions typically measure between 2m and 2.5m at the boundary line. The proposal, for a 3.6m extension, is far beyond the realms of what is reasonable in this context, and is over 1.5m higher than existing. For this reason, the application in its current form should be refused.

2. Impact on our amenity: The applicant's drawing 2306 LSD 20200 misrepresents our extension to purportedly demonstrate there is no impact on us by the proposal. The applicant's drawing is incorrect, showing our extension inaccurately, especially in the position of our rooflight. We will provide via email (as we cannot attach anything to this form) an accurate drawing, which is to scale and shows our actual extension, and shows that there will be a significant impact on us. Not only will we be able to see the extension from inside our own kitchen (we were required to ensure the same when we applied for permission), but the extension's parapet is so high that it will certainly block light from entering our kitchen. The applicant's drawings are inaccurate and cannot be relied upon for the application to be determined. For this reason too, the application should be refused.

We are not in principle against an extension, perhaps a compromise is for the applicant's extension to mirror our own. This would have no impact on useable internal space for the applicant, would improve their internal ceiling heights, and would have no impact on our own amenity or the appearance of the terrace, so we feel it is reasonable.

We would welcome you to visit our home and observe the likely impact from our side.

Best,

Susannah Fitzherbert-Brockholes and Alex Martin