

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/6213/P	Daniel E. Smith	2 Lakis Close	12/11/2014 14:20:04	OBJLETTE R	Objection letter posted 12 November. Please notify me of committee dates.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
-----------------	------------------	------------------	-----------	----------	-----------

2014/6213/P	Adam & Nicola Wilcox	4 Lakis Close NW3 1JX	12/11/2014 14:31:12	OBJEMPER	Dear Sir/Madam
-------------	-------------------------	--------------------------	---------------------	----------	----------------

RE APPLICATION 2014/6213/P
DEVELOPMENT AT 35 FLASK WALK

Having reviewed the full Householder Planning Application and Listed Building Consent Application, including the examining the drawings and reading the Design and Access Statement, I would like to raise my concerns and lodge my objections to the proposal as set out below:

1 - As the owner of no. 4 Lakis Close, we currently enjoy a limited view from our living & dining room, across the rear gardens of flask walk. The proposed development raises the height of the current "lower" boundary wall, by approximately 1.5m, for a distance of approximately 1.5m which would entirely block the existing limited view.

2 - This portion of the raised wall is less than 4m from, and directly in front of, our dining room window. This would not be permitted under any current planning policies or guidelines for new developments.

3 - We feel that the application as submitted is extremely misleading in many aspects but in particular we would expect the existing parapet outline to be clearly dotted on the proposed elevations and sections to clarify the above points demonstrating that our amenity has been substantially compromised.

4 - We feel that the DAS as submitted is also extremely misleading and would like to point out that point 2), under 3.2 Proposed Development, states that the roof height is the same, however, part of the existing lower roof is raised to provide a larger foot print at 1st floor level, which as stated above will have a negative impact on the current limited view we enjoy.

5 - Considering the above points, 3 and 4, we question whether the intention of the current application is to deceive. We would request that the application and DAS be amended to truly represent the intention of the application.

6 - Should permission be granted for a reduced scheme, without the extended first floor footprint, we request that there be a specific condition stating that the annex can not be separated and used as self contained dwelling, as we feel this would be an over development of the site putting an additional strain on local services and specifically access & parking.

7 - We are also concerned that the boundary defining the permission application is in error - the red boundary line taking areas of Lakis Close that are in fact the property of the residents of the close.

8 - The boundary also appears to show access from the side door of the listed building extending onto Lakis close - where I believe there are no access rights - personal permission to the previous owner only being granted due to the need for disabled access.

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

9 - The property has only just changed hands - and so the argument given that the expansion of the dwelling space is necessary for the continued occupation by the applicant must also surely be spurious.

We realise that there are many other concerns regarding this development which would be dealt with by the Party Wall Act, and Building Regulations Act should permission be granted and the works proceed, however, we strongly believe that the points raised above should be taken into account when you consider the merits of the current planning application and we expect the application as it stands to be rejected.

I would be grateful for acknowledgement of receipt of this email. With thanks.

Yours sincerely

Adam & Nicola Wilcox

2014/6213/P	Andrew Holmes	37 Redington Road NW3 7QY	11/11/2014 12:04:05	OBJEMPER	<p>I wish to object to the plans as submitted to this grade II listed cottage dating from the 1770's.</p> <p>As one of four matching cottages, all with original exterior features, the scheme to add a glazed walkway to link the main house to the existing detached artist's studio is out of character with the house and the neighbouring buildings.</p> <p>Also to make this purpose-build studio into a habitable room plus an additional basement area strikes me as over building in this already congested plot.</p> <p>On the basis of these strong objection I ask the planning committee to reject the scheme.</p>
-------------	---------------	------------------------------	---------------------	----------	---
