

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4979/P	Mrs Janet Harrison	2 The Gables Vale of Health	18/09/2014 20:11:58	COMMNT	<p>I am responding to Planning Application 2014/4979/P as the owner-occupier of 2 The Gables, the neighbouring property.</p> <p>I do not formally object to the latest application, but do have a number of observations that I would like to be taken into account.</p> <p>The overall footprint (of the previously approved infill, the permitted development and the latest application) is significantly larger than developments at numbers 2 and 4 and will inevitably impact the outlook of the row.</p> <p>In this context, the reductions to the footprint and height (including the angle of the roof) of the 'Permitted Extension' are material factors in reducing the total impact of the entire development, including reducing overshadowing and impact on the outlook of number 2.</p> <p>However, I would be concerned if the combined proposed extension could subsequently be extended further, through Planning Permission or Permitted Development, or if it became a starting point for larger developments in other properties in the row.</p>
2014/4979/P	Martin Rushton-Turner	4 The Gables Vale of Health Hampstead London NW3 1AY	08/09/2014 19:42:44	INT	<p>I am the owner and occupier of 4 The Gables.</p> <p>From the plans I have seen, I do not think the proposed conservatory (if adhering to the proposed design - particularly as to height, distance away from my fence and curvature away) would materially adversely impact me. .</p> <p>It is ultimately a policy question whether the planners and council feel there should be limits to discretionary permissions for expansion of properties in the Vale of Health. In my view there should be such limits.</p> <p>I note that this application is itself seeking to "link" two further planning consents obtained for the property. The first (an infill) was subject to planning review. The second (expansion back from the closet wall) was (as I understand it) a result of a relatively recent statutory change (giving automatic permission) rather than considered consent itself. The proposed expansion will have an overall footprint materially larger than that implemented at No 2 - and far larger than at the other 4 houses on the Gables. Permission may encourage an unseemly race for everyone to extend. There ought not to be a presumption of a right to extend unless harming others - as purchasers / owners we did not buy houses with development potential - but homes with pre-existing character.</p> <p>However, with all that said - the actual proposal would seem to have limited effect on me personally.</p>