

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2016/0372/P | Mark Webber | 134 Torriano Avenue | 15/06/2016 12:01:18 | INT | <p>As one of the many original objectors to this application, I appreciate now having the opportunity to comment on the new application.</p> <p>Having had the opportunity to look through the documents relating to 2016/0372/P, I would like to draw your attention to two matters that appear on the application form.</p> <p>"Application Form (No Personal Data).PDF"</p> <p>10. Vehicle Parking The applicant states that there is currently 1 existing parking space for 137 Torriano Avenue, and that the 1 space would be retained. - As 137 Torriano Avenue does not yet exist, it cannot have an existing parking space. The high demand for parking spaces in this area, which currently exceeds demand - meaning that we can rarely park outside our own houses - was a frequently stated objection to both developments. As far as I recall, it was a condition of the original application, following consultation, that no parking spaces would ever be granted to any of the new dwellings. This ruling should therefore be carried forward to the new application. - Item 5.14 of the Planning Statement states: "The Undertaking also made a commitment to a construction management plan and car free housing. The applicant is happy to revise the Undertaking so that it is applicable to the current proposal."</p> <p>14. Existing Use Please describe the current use of the site: "The site is vacant" Is the site currently vacant? No. - This is a misleading contradiction of facts. I do not know whether or not such a contradiction could work in favour of the applicant regarding the decision to grant permission.</p> <p>Furthermore, retaining the sycamore tree that was in the pub garden was also a recommendation following the consultation. The tree is present on all submitted drawings, but according to Mr McWatters, both the tree and its roots have now been removed from the site. Aside from the environmental considerations, the removal of the roots is surely a dangerous and misguided act considering that this area is particularly at risk from subsidence. My property and many local residents have been affected by subsidence in the past, likely due to the clay soil and the incline on this part of the street.</p> <p>These matters all indicate a general disregard that the developer and his agents have for the council's rulings and recommendations.</p> <p>I also note the objection from Thames Water regarding the inadequacy of the "existing wastewater infrastructure" and the dangers of the proximity of this development to public sewers.</p> |

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

Many of my original objections to the development still stand, and these were detailed in my original submissions to the application and appeal. Following that process, I am still particularly concerned with the following, in addition to the above :-

- The loss of light and the loss of the unobstructed view that I currently have over that site, particularly from our upper floors.

- Being overlooked by the occupants of the new houses and the further loss of privacy (in addition to the new flats that have been approved above the pub).

- The loss of the pub garden and its affect on the local community - not only the absence of outdoor community space attached to the pub, but also the direct effect it has on our household by forcing the pub's noisy, smoking patrons out onto the street directly opposite us. They also block the narrow pavement on the Brecknock Road side, making it difficult for pedestrians to pass by.

- Insufficient provision for the pub's commercial waste bins to be kept off the street. (They were originally stored in the garden.)

I hope that you will consider these points in reviewing the decision.
