

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2015/1217P | Jane Hives | 24 Grove Terrace | 13/04/2015 16:42:03 | OBJ | <p>It is unclear from the documentation whether it is intended to change the front lightwell and significantly reduce the front garden in similar terms to the previous application (2014/7203/L and 2014/7024/P). If this is the case, I object to the proposals, which should be turned down because they would destroy the historic frontage of Grove Terrace.</p> <p>There has been a minor reduction in the size of the proposed rear extension from the original application, but it remains entirely out of proportion with the house and all other rear extensions in the Terrace. In particular, it is vastly greater in bulk than that at No 19. The latter was objected to strongly by Grove Terrace residents, especially because it might set a precedent. However, I do not believe that there is any precedent in this instance. In addition, the conservatory at No 19 is much narrower, shorter, lighter and less imposing. The proposed rear extension fills the entire width of the plot and with its proposed courtyard, would be very intrusive in the landscape of the Terrace rear gardens. The extensive excavation required to build out the proposals would undermine adjoining buildings, as well as the historic garden walls, which are part of the listing.</p> <p>For all of these reasons, I object to the proposed new rear extension and courtyard.</p> |
| 2015/1217P | Michael Lilley | 24 Grove Terrace | 13/04/2015 16:44:49 | OBJ | <p>I am writing to object to the new rear extension, because it is far too large and together with the proposed courtyard, it will harm the rear landscape, adjoining listed buildings and walls of Grove Terrace.</p> |