

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/6300/P	Tim Leach	36 Highgate West Hill	17/11/2014 22:52:13	OBJ	<p>The current hoarding along the street (for which I assume planning consent has not been granted) and the current condition of the walling is unacceptable. The applicant should be required to implement the replacement of this hoarding with the fence / hedging generally as illustrated in the current proposals prior to a review/consent being granted for any proposals for the garage.</p> <p>Whilst we generally welcome the improvements to the landscape along the street, the scale / type of development (quite easily adapted to two floors of habitable accommodation) will enable residential use for, or independent of, 41. The existing pedestrian / vehicular access would support independent use.</p> <p>The existing street access is to be used by delivery and service vehicles, backing out onto the street. This is not appropriate or safe. It is also apparent that this service access could and in all likelihood will be used for the regular servicing of the gardens beyond the wood; for social events and / or maintenance. This should not be permitted and all servicing should be via the main entrance to 41.</p> <p>For proposals featuring a (reduced ht.) "summer house" to be granted consent, this should be conditional on the existing vehicular access being permanently closed (it is certainly not needed for a "summer house"), the footway/raised curb reinstated and a continuous security fence/hedge provided in lieu of the proposed gates.</p> <p>This is a particularly noisy, polluted section of Highgate West Hill and the attractiveness of a summer house in a "quite" woodland setting is very questionable. It's debatable that the development will ever be used as intended and, therefore, is much more likely to be converted - without consent - to habitable accommodation. This has all the marks of residential development by stealth.</p> <p>The height of the new summer house is excessive (3M to eaves from the floor and 6M to top of roof) and will have a detrimental impact on the woodland, adjacent street and neighbouring properties.</p> <p>The relationship of the new structure to the old is unconvincing, with the summer house looking down onto a service yard! and leaving the opportunity for subsequent conversation/adaptation of the lower ground floor for residential accommodation with its own pedestrian / vehicular access.</p> <p>If a reduced ht. summer house is to be granted consent, a more convincing solution would be for the garage and access drive to be infilled and returned to a wooded landscape, thereby completely surrounding the summerhouse with an appropriate landscape setting.</p> <p>The height of the new boundary fence is excessive. 2M height as the adjacent fence indicated on drawings would suffice.</p> <p>The application form makes reference to Grade II listed building but no application for listed building consent has been submitted.</p>