

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/5086/P	Jennifer Mills	29/01/2024 16:54:42	COMMNT	<p>As the freeholder, since 1983, of 7 Perrin's Lane I am concerned that the architectural unity of the terrace is maintained.</p> <p>1. The drawing of the existing front elevation includes the shiplap cladding above the first floor windows of nos. 9, 7, 7A and 13, but omits it from no. 11. The Design and Access statement para 4.10 states that the walls at the rear and side will include white painted shiplap timber, but omits any mention of the front. I submit that any consent should also stipulate shiplap cladding above the front window.</p> <p>2. Moving the front door will destroy the architectural unity of the terrace.</p> <p>3. The 2nd floor dormer should be of the same size as the dormers on neighbouring properties and the glazing should be frosted/opaque to preserve the privacy of the terraces at nos. 3 and 5 Perrin's Lane. Both these properties are owned and occupied by elderly ladies, who are probably not able to register their own objection, but were concerned about their privacy when nos. 9 and 7 sought permission to add 2nd floor dormers.</p> <p>4. Although not impacting on me personally, I note that the Design and Access statement says that a dedicated parking space to Prince Arthur Mews will be retained. It should be noted that no. 11's parking space is in the area in front of Prince Arthur Court and, as far as I am aware, no. 11 has no rights within Prince Arthur Mews. The 2 parking spaces by the wall of no. 11 belong to 13 Perrin's Lane and 9 Prince Arthur Mews.</p> <p>5. The proposed enclosed courtyard area on the ground floor plan does not seem feasible, especially if no. 11 has no rights within Prince Arthur Mews.</p>

---