

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2015/2469/P | Alison Kemp | 59 Princess Road | 03/06/2015 07:34:11 | OBJ | <p>I wish to object to this application for the following grounds.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The corner positioned proposed windows to the extension are not designed to accord with the general fenestration patterns in the street . The 2 storey height glazing to the main rear elevation of the building is also unlike anything else in the street. Overall the position and extent of the glazing will result in greater intrusion into my premises (house and garden). 2. The application to delete the railings and replace with brickwork to a first floor terrace. This structure was extended above its original height only a few years ago. The existing terrace is actually above a 3 storey extension and therefore is at 2nd floor level. Increasing the height of this blocks out more daylight and sunlight than. 3. The proposed single storey extension is completely unacceptable. The only existing extension of this type in the street is at number 18 Edis Street. This dates from at least 30 years ago but there can be no presumption of precedent under current planning law. Edis Street and Princess Road were built very close together 150 years ago. Gardens were always tiny, smaller than most in the area. Building over any gardens in Edis Street therefore significantly impacts the adjacent Princess Road houses. The structure would be too close and too high to be anything but a significant eyesore as seen from my garden, blocking day and sun light and reducing privacy and increasing noise nuisance due to proposed use of the rooms. 4. Discrepancies were noted in the drawings and documentation including the following:- <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Basement floor and garden levels shown in 17 Edis street as significantly below those in 57 or 59 Princess Rd – this is incorrect as these levels are approximately equal in the 2 streets b) There exists a relatively large tree in the garden of 17 Edis Street garden; this is misrepresented as if it is in a Princess Rd garden (which it is not). c) The rear party boundary wall of 17 Edis is shared not only with 59 Princess but also 57 Princess; this is not shown correctly on the plans submitted. d) The application document refers to 17 Edis as having use class C1 – Hotel. This house has always been a single dwelling house, never a hotel, during the last 30 years. 5. Construction of the proposed extension would affect the structural stability of no 59 Princess Rd and the various party boundary walls. The water table is already high because we are at the bottom of a hill – flood risk is increased. |