

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0501/P	Isanna Curcio	36 Shoot Up Hill London NW2 3QB	21/02/2017 21:55:04	OBJ	<p>We, the owners of 36 Shoot-Up Hill, are objecting to the planning application made by 40A Shoot Up Hill for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) If the erection of a structure to create a first floor were permitted, it would overlook directly into our rear and front garden as well as down into windows on our property depriving us of privacy, as well as light and air. In addition to the first floor extension, the proposed large conservatory would also be visible well over the garden fence as well as coming up against our fence line, absorbing nearly all of 40A's garden. This would adversely effect our enjoyment of our outdoor space, valued highly in London. The conservatory and first floor would tower over our land as well as overlook our property resulting in our property feeling entirely enclosed, and building up what is currently a small quiet garden area. The size and scale of the structure which proposes to more than double the current property would not blend into the area and feels cramped into a small space.2) The location map on the main page of the application on the website is erroneous - it suggests the plot of 40A is much larger than it is - this map includes our rear garden and also includes 40 Shoot Up Hill in the plan. These do not form part of 40A. Moreover, the application plans do not detail the current and proposed changes to the entire plot at 40A, including how far into their own garden (and up against our fence line) the conservatory would extend. From our knowledge of the garden at 40A which abuts our garden, the conservatory would absorb almost all of the current garden at 40A right up against our fence.3) The property is currently used as a business (a nursery - http://bodhitreenursery.co.uk/) during the day which does mean there is a fair bit of daily noise in our garden. Whilst we tolerate this, we would assume this would greatly increase if the space were enlarged to the large extent proposed. This would change the feel of the gardens in this residential area. We assume it will not be a residence but will continue to operate as a business.4) Finally, these plans appear almost identical to the ones proposed in March 2016 which were refused on the grounds of 1. The building's "Mass bulk and scale would result in harm to the character and appearance if the host building " and 2. "Would cause harmful overlooking to neighbouring properties". Surely these reasons for refusal still stand as little has changed from the previous application. <p>We would wish to be notified of the committee date.</p>
