Response 1 Edna Young

- 1. We feel our extension design has a very positive effect on the area. As explained in the separate Design Notes Sheet.
- 2. We are letting the building be its own entity and remain the gravity for the site, while carefully adding an extension that sits softly against this. As in the Design Notes Sheet
- 3. The Pear is not healthy and is damaging the houses & drains; we are also looking to replant a mature replacement to improve on the current tree.
- 4. We are happy to look at replanting and overlooking would not be increased form its current state for an access stair that is occasionally used.
- 5. There is no roof terrace.

Response 2 Lucy & Andrew Penney Garden Flat 22E Fitzjohns

- 1. We have done 2 x screen shots & added 1 x photo, to show that the lighting will be improved by the removal of the tree. The house is due dead East, hence light in the afternoon is not direct.
- 2. Our design is explained in out D&A Report, there is strong precedent and to differentiate between old and new. The open nature of the structure adds gravity to the original building and the uprights to be in a bronze cladding (matching the existing brick in tone) line through with the original features. See Design Notes 3. There is no roof terrace.
- 4. The removal of the Pear tree that is in average condition and damaging the buildings, will allow a considerable amount more light in, we are happy to discuss an appropriate planting scheme for the site.
- 5. Given the increased light and better planting we feel there will be a benefit to the garden flat at number 20.

Response 3 Sonal Keay 22D Fitzjohns Avenue

- 1. These are general remarks on design, we feel our design is explained in out D&A Report, there is strong precedent and to differentiate between old and new. The open nature of the structure adds gravity to the original building and the uprights to be in a bronze cladding (matching the existing brick in tone) line through with the original features. See Design Notes
- 2. The Extension has a very limited impact over the fence line. 0.9m x 3m
- 3. There is no terrace

Response 4 Dr John Miller. 22A Fitzjohns Avenue

- 1. Measurements are on the drawings.
- 2. The materials have been carefully chosen to suit the existing structure so as in a manner not to drawn away from the existing building. Predominantly this is bronze and glass of the highest quality. See design notes on materials and policy.
- 3. Not sure how privacy is lost?
- 4. We can use anti Glare Glass if required.
- 5. Any terrace would only allow an equal amount of overlooking that is currently allowed for.

Response 5 Dr S M Gumpel Flat B 18 Fitzjohns Avenue

- 1. It is not possible for there to be a severe loss of light, the fence is 1887mm away and the building 4195mm away. It should be noted that 18 Fitzjohn's also has a very narrow pathway to their garden that is right next to the boundary fence. The reason for this is that the garden flat at 18 Fitzjohn's seems to own a small part of the communal garden directly outside their flat so, they erected a fence between their garden boundary and the communal path. As a result, 18 Fitzjohn's has a very narrow path and has no room to plant between their pathway and the boundary fence. We have still maintained the ability to plant by the boundary and are happy to do so.
- 2. Our design is explained in out D&A Report, there is strong precedent and to differentiate between old and new. The open nature of the structure adds gravity to the original building and the uprights to be in a bronze cladding (matching the existing brick in tone) line through with the original features. See Design Notes
- 3. The Pear Tree is in average shape as category C and we have offered to replant a mature specimen to benefit all properties in years to come. It is also causing damage to the building and drainage system.
- 4. We would be happy to plant a pleached screen, with the stairs to be reused it is predominantly a handrail that will be seen.
- 5. There is no roof terrace.

Response 6 Nathalie Glaser Flat 2 20 Fitzjohns Avenue

1. The presence of the Occupants in the Garden Flat will be felt no more profoundly than any extension would provide, as with the extension at number 18.

2. The size of the garden still remains 36.5m, which we feel is considerable for the area and well above requirements. In response to being "crowded further towards the far end of the garden". Until this year approximately half of the garden was not usable because it had 4 large flower beds in the middle and back sides that were over-grown by weeds. So the entire back half of the garden was not usable and an eye sore to us and the neighbors. The Garden Flat owners personally paid to have these flower beds re-turfed thus, opening up 50% more garden space for the Leaseholders to enjoy, which they could not previously use.

In terms of the size of the extension our proposal would end a good margin before the end of the staircase from the Fuss' terrace. This staircase has always created a natural boundary meaning that Leaseholders do not come closer to the property/Garden Flat than the end of the staircase. Therefore, we are not taking any space previously used by any other Leaseholder so, we are not "crowding them in the back of the garden" with this extension.

"Nevertheless, tenants of the four flats above, are entitled to full use of the garden, do keep their distance from the Garden Flat to enhance their own enjoyment of the seclusion of the garden." Which essentially means nobody currently uses the space now. So, it is not possible to become crowded to the rear of the garden if we add an extension to the space that the Leaseholders never currently use

- 3. The Head Lease is actually owned by Mr Borzou Shirazi, who is very supportive of the scheme and will be writing this separately, also it should be noted that he owns the first floor flat, which has been confirmed recently, so these are not valid comments. It should also be noted the Fuss's who own the raised ground flat are very supportive of the scheme and have not objected.
- 4. Speculation for an adjoining property. No comment.