

From: Larry Trachtenberg [Sent: 11 May 2013 16:02 To: Freeney, Fergus Cc: bradleybrown; Mofflitt, Keith (Councillor) Subject: RE: 33 Crediton Hill 2013/1540/P Importance: High

Dear Mr Freeney

Further to my note below, and for your information, the re-alignment of the stairs which is the subject of this application would appear to have already been completed.

As with many refurbishment/redevelopment projects in this area, I wonder why people even bother with planning applications as they seem to carry on and do what they wish regardless any rules or protocols. This is not a criticism of the Planning Department but rather the attitude of builders and architects who seem to run roughshod over the system as a whole.

Many thanks

Larry Trachtenberg

From: Larry Trachtenberg Sent: 10 May 2013 16:47 To: 'Freeney, Fergus' Cc: bradleybrown Subject: RE: 33 Crediton Hill 2013/1540/P Importance: High

Dear Mr Freeney

Thanks again for your note re: 33 Crediton Hill 2013/1540/P. I would like to make the following comments:

- 1. With reference to the Design & Access Statement
 - a. Para 1.3 states that the patio doors have not yet been installed. This is in fact now no longer the case – the patio doors were installed approximately two weeks ago.
 - b. Para 1.7 (2) We do not actually understand this part of the application at all. The application requests changing the patio doors from a wooden framed door to an aluminium framed door. However, until the aluminium doors were installed in the past two weeks, there were <u>NO doors ever</u> installed on this new extension. We must presume the application is for something contemplated but never executed.
 - c. Para 2.2 We have no objection to the proposed realignment of the front stairs, however there is local concern that work may have already commenced on this project. As the property is completely enshrouded by locked hoarding it is impossible to know for certain but extensive jack hammering has been taking place in the front of the property for over two weeks.
 - d. Para 2.2 Item 1 We would question the use of Portland Stone as a suitable material for the front steps as this is not generally in keeping with the other homes in the area. One other newly refurbished property on the street has rebuilt their front steps with a further material what appears to be grey slate which is also out of keeping with the area and we would be concerned about builders recommending any and all 'natural materials' as being "in step with the conservation area" when this is in fact not the case. In time we will end up with a complete mess of differing materials and finishes which further degrades the quality of the Conservation Area.
- 2. With reference to the Site Drawings
 - a. Planning Drawing Fig 6, a picture of the rear elevation shows that on the left side of the first floor elevation above the 'roof' of the new extension, there is an original window. HOWEVER, this window has in fact been removed (several weeks ago) and replaced with double doors on to what is now a <u>roof terrace</u>, with considerable overlooking of properties to both sides. This root terrace could not have been contemplated when the Certificate of Lawfulness was considered and would appear to fall outside of permitted development under that Certificate. It creates a considerable loss of privacy to both neighbours who (along with this CAAC) had no opportunity to consider this development.
- 3. General points
 - a. We note that all of the white pebble dash finish on the house has been removed and replaced with a smooth white rendered finished (including the chinneys) which is totally out of Keeping with every other similar property on the street. I would point to CDP2010 Para 24.13 of the Local Planning Policy which states that "Development should not undermine any existing unformity of a street or ignore patterns or groupings of buildings". CDP2010 Para 24.11 is also relevant here.

I hope this is useful and I look forward to hearing back form you in due course.

Regards

