

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3067/P	Lucy Findlay	21/09/2023 12:46:15	OBJ	<p>I write in my capacity as owner of the adjoined neighbouring (semi-detached) house (45 Compayne Gardens), occupier of the ground and first floor (merged) flat and member of the CRASH committee. I would like to object to several aspects of this application and point out some inaccuracies in the application.</p> <p>The application should be accompanied by a BIA. The front of the property (marked as storage on existing plans) is not an existing basement, it is a crawl space and has not been excavated unless this was done without permission in the previous approved applications (2003 and 2004). The application seeks to dig even further down in the front and rear and extend further into the garden. The proposal to extend the basement even further into the garden will also require extensive digging and loss of additional garden due to the combination of extending the basement element of the extension, increased depth of terrace, proposed area of patio in addition to the terrace and length of the stairs into the garden from the basement. In my view this represents over development at the site.</p> <p>While the D&amp;A statement notes a large tree at the rear of the garden, the plans do not mark the existence of a mature, beautiful prunus tree in the garden which would be near/in the proposed steps up from the extended basement and there is a risk of damage to its root network with the works proposed (an arboricultural statement should be included).</p> <p>The D&amp;A statement states there are four flats in the property - there are six - unless two have been unlawfully merged.</p> <p>There are no details provided (noise, size, housing materials) about an air conditioning unit proposed to be sited in the rear garden.</p> <p>By virtue of the extended terrace proposed and its height above ground level there will be far greater visual intrusion (direct views) into my living areas (ground level) and bedroom (1st floor rear). No screening has been included in the proposal to reduce this for the adjoining ground floor flat at no.47 or at no.45. A low level glass balustrade at raised ground level is out of keeping with this stretch of Compayne and will not provide any visual protection. Currently there is trellising to the raised terrace (required in the 2004 planning decision to reduce visual intrusion).</p> <p>The handrail proposed to the front light well is completely out of keeping with the area - it will neither enhance or preserve the conservation area - a grill at ground level would be appropriate as per other light wells in the conservation area if consent is given.</p> <p>No details are provided about the (welcome) new bin storage - height materials?</p>