

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/4698/P	Stephen Davis	27/11/2023 06:28:47	OBJ	<p>The planning application contains a number of material errors, which I hope will result in the retrospective application being refused. These are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>∩ Contrary to the submission, which asserts the pergola ∩ does not exceed the height of the existing boundary fence∩, it is in fact higher by several centimetres. Photographs are available to prove this.</li> <li>∩ Contrary to the submission, the pergola is not ∩considerate to the neighbouring properties and surrounding area∩ [and] is situated discreetly in the corner of the garden at a lower height than the fence so that it does not impact on visual amenity∩. Rather, it seriously impacts our visual amenity and impinges materially on the view from every window in the rear elevation of our property. It dominates the garden, taking up almost half the available area.</li> <li>∩ Contrary to the submission, the ∩materiality∩ of the pergola does not ∩contribute towards a high quality and durable finish, which respects the character and appearance of the conservation area∩. The dark finish and the scale is not in character with the green setting of the gardens that spread out between the backs of all the buildings. Its scale and materiality are not in line with the principles set out in the Belsize Conservation Area appraisal and management strategy.</li> <li>∩ Contrary to the submission, the ∩identified application in the surrounding area∩ are not ∩similar pergola proposals∩ either in terms of ∩size..materiality∩ or ∩position in the rear garden∩.</li> <li>∩ Contrary to the submission, the application is not entitled to ∩benefit from permitted development∩ (GPDO 2015) and does not ∩fall.. within the limits of permitted development∩.</li> </ul>

---

**Total: 12**