

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/5705/P	pauline Thomas	67 redington road london	05/11/2014 09:24:01	OBJ	<p>I should like to object to Planning Application Ref 2014/5705/P on the grounds of noise and disturbance (vibrations, smells and fumes) which would adversely affect my family residing in the adjoining property.</p> <p>The application envisions a vertical shaft and a large grille in front of the current garage. This proposed vent is likely to result in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* a significant increase in noise and disturbance and other problems while the heavy machinery is in operation, which will mean that we would not be able to enjoy our property in the way that we can at present.</li> <li>* This is a residential area, and the introduction of a ventilation shaft in the front garden is intrusive and introduces a diverse element that by reason of the use is likely to result in noise, disturbance and nuisance to our detriment</li> <li>* we are concerned that, as the large grille is in front of a 2 car garage, the noise of the cars going over what is in effect a large cattle-grid will be very intrusive. In addition, there seems to be no precedent for a front of house ventilation shaft in the area,</li> </ul> <p>I would like to raise two further points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Neither we nor our party wall surveyor were notified of this planning application, either by letter, email or in person, and neither have the proposals at any point been discussed with us</li> <li>2) The current development at 69 has been the subject of numerous planning applications, some allowed and others withdrawn before they were examined by the planners. It appears that the current development is now materially different from the previous plan, and yet work has commenced and continues to proceed on the basis of assuming that this planning application 2014/5705/P will be definitely granted. The piecemeal approach to applying for planning permission for the various elements of the new scheme is inequitable. If approved, it would create a poor precedent, in that it would encourage the belated application for additional works to support a project that might not have gone ahead unchallenged had such a crucial element been raised in the first place</li> </ol> <p>In conclusion we would also like to request that, should the application be approved, the Council consider using its powers to enforce controlled hours of operation of the plant and pool equipment etc (eg filtration, ventilation or any operation that requires the use of noise-making equipment) and other restrictions that might make noise and disturbance emanating from the property more bearable.</p>