

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/5097/P	Susan Drecksler	12 Limes Avenue London NW7 3PA	06/03/2017 14:36:15	COMMNT	<p>Objection to possible extension 114 Fortune Green Road NW61DH From the freeholder and tenants of 112 Fortune Green Road</p> <p>Grounds are: loss of light/ overshadowing; overlooking/ loss of privacy. -</p> <p>Key concern from 2nd floor perspective relates to overlooking/loss of privacy due to the balcony extension. It can already feel intrusive without adding more space for more people.</p> <p>Also, extending 1st floor out over the other patio would impact view from the bedroom and kitchen windows.</p> <p>Re 1st floor : The area surveyed is already a 'damp trap' and the extension won't help in this regard.</p> <p>Re: picture from 2nd floor bedroom, which can be referenced against the proposals. Note that the 1st floor extension would extend both in width and depth from existing external wall to cover the existing ground floor (which is the outcome of a badly done extension a few years back). Photos to show this sent with separate email</p>
2016/5097/P	Jamie Innes	Top floor 112 Fortune Green Road NW6 1DH NW6 1DH	07/03/2017 16:58:47	INT	<p>Being resident at neighbouring flat at 112 Fortune Green rd I am particularly concerned that this proposed extension will impact my privacy. The 2nd floor balcony extension will provide a nearby and direct view into my bedroom. I am also concerned about light. Should the balcony be fitted with any sort of privacy screen then this will impact direct light not only into same bedroom but also our bathroom.</p> <p>I see no 3D modelling in the impact of light survey. The survey, in my opinion, does not reflect real world scenario and should be subject to further scrutiny.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/5097/P	Lois George	12 Weech Road	06/03/2017 19:05:52	OBJEMPER	<p>Dear Mr Diver, I am writing in to object to the above proposal on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Loss of privacy as very close to some neighbouring properties/boundaries. This means many more residents will be overlooked at very close quarters. This will be very intrusive. 2) It will create a precedent as to the distance a person can extend outwards towards a neighbouring property. 3) Where would materials for use and demolished materials be stored? Due to the ground floor being extended already there is very little outside space for storage of materials needed for rebuilding or extending current building. 4) this proposal will be and overuse of the area. 5) if accepted it will be overload at the rear of the building. This would set a precedent which others are sure to want to follow. 6) what should be and has been part of a green oasis is becoming more of a brick and glass jungle. 7) 114 is joined to other shops, and residential premises, plus more residential premises at the rear. which would be inconvenienced by noise, mess, dust and further pollution during works, in an area of London already suffering unacceptable high pollution levels. 8) I am concerned and disheartened to see that so many errors have been made in The Design and Access Statement. This does not show care to checking details and accuracy which I hope would not be replicated in the building work this proposal were accepted. <p>Some of concerns are:</p> <p>D and A Statement only states "rear 1st floor extension" What about 2nd floor roof extension?</p> <p>USE "commercial ground floor and residential...1st and 2nd floors" What about the flat at the rear ground floor is ground floor not part commercial/part residential?</p> <p>2nd paragraph states: "owner....having trouble with facilities at 2nd floor level....proposing ...rear extension to convert living room to an ensuite bedroom." No,(a) the living room is at the front of 114 not at the rear, that area is presently a dinning room</p> <p>(b) This is shown on the plan and elevation to be at 1st floor level not 2nd floor. The bedroom here will be extended over the ground floor flat.</p> <p>c) If the owner is having "difficulty" at 2nd floor level then why is he extending the present large roof</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>terrace even further... Proposing to cover the whole of the rear extensions.?</p> <p>under LAYOUT it states "the 1st floor will be extended by and additional 11sq m....2nd floor is unchanged." This contradicts what it says in USE plus the balcony at 2nd floor level, would be doubled in size intruding on those around 114. There are very, very few 2nd floor balconies in the immediate area, one was turned down nearby in Ingham road few weeks ago as it is an invasion of others privacy enabling neighbours to be so overlooked. This 2nd floor balcony would intrude on many if allowed to be so extended. But why does he want it to be so extended when the proposals say he is having "trouble ..at 2nd floor level."?</p> <p>These are my main points for objecting to this proposal for 114 Fortune Green Road.</p>

2016/5097/P	Jonathan Sass on behalf of Green & White Ltd	Green & White Ltd 112 Fortune Green Road London NW6 1DH	05/03/2017 11:29:36	OBJNOT	<p>We occupy the ground floor of 112 Fortune Green Road which is adjoining. We have commercial use and we use our rear yard in the course of our business. We sell and repair Industrial Cleaning Equipment and have been here for almost 30 years. The proposal will seriously affect the light to this yard and could be a hazard as we need plenty of light for our operatives. It would also affect our privacy as we have an outside toilet in the rear yard and will be overshadowed. Their Daylight Assesment report does not take this in to account. We intend to apply for a ground floor rear extension in the future and that would be affected by this proposal in a similar way.</p>
-------------	--	--	---------------------	--------	--
