

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/4363/P	A H Hammad	Flat 2 10 Strathray Gardens London NW3 4NY	27/09/2016 18:00:37	OBJ	<p>We object for the following reasons:</p> <p>1/ Notably, the applicant for this planning has confirmed to us personally that this is an opportunistic plan funded by a developer who is exploiting the vulnerable leaseholder (the applicant) by funding the extension for his own commercial gain. It seems highly unlikely that the current occupier, the applicant, will benefit from the extension or use it in future. The planned extension will be to the sole benefit of the developer as it maximises his economic advantage.</p> <p>2/ The plan does not fundamentally take into consideration the harm to the surrounding ecosystem. In order to carry out the building along side the shared garden wall, the applicant will need to destroy the cotoneaster trees that are currently in place and which beautify the landscape. These trees are integral to our environment and they provide privacy for multiple neighbours, and they are vital to the general biology and animal system in the area. We seek a TPO to protect these trees as soon as feasible and we would vigorously seek their protection.</p> <p>3/ The planned one storey building will also be significantly higher than the shared boundary wall and will create not only an eyesore, it will also infringe on our privacy as it will overlook our garden and block sunlight. This is also not in keeping with the other garden extensions in the area which are built more towards the centre of gardens and to the back towards the houses rather than along side shared garden walls. It is incumbent on the applicant to consider preserving as much of the garden space as possible and ensuring symmetry and harmony as is the norm in a conservation area.</p> <p>4/ There is very little evidence in these plans that they will be in keeping with the surrounding designs and seem to be contrary to the criteria of a conservation area.</p> <p>5/ The height of the extension and its design will cause a security hazard for neighbours particularly our property which is immediately next door and this would need further careful consideration.</p> <p>6/ The application also indicates that communal areas which currently provide mutual privacy between the flats and allow for good security, will be used to build the extension. We strongly object to this and we are surprised that the head freeholder has agreed to this. We would like to see freeholder consent for this and to investigate it further. Once the extension is built we will be more vulnerable and our privacy infringed as we are immediately next door. Again careful consideration would need to be made and perhaps expert advice applied.</p> <p>7/ It is inexplicable why the developer wishes to build alongside the north garden wall which borders our property rather than along side the south wall (further away) which is the more logical choice as it borders the outer wall next to the Hereward House school next door. This south wall is also higher and has a tree line behind it which provides good privacy all round.</p> <p>8/ Alternatively, the extension could be built to make better use of the garden space so that it is built with minimal impact to the bordering neighbours with ample space intact so that privacy is maintained, security not breached, and the ecosystem protected as well as the precious trees and overall plant habitat protected, too. The current plan is a forceful infringement on our neighbourhood rights to maintain a high standard to the surroundings of our conservation area and protect it from commercially motivated development plans which are not in keeping with the communal best interests of all.</p>