From:

Sent:

30 May 2017 23:01

То:

Whittredge, Emily; Stopard, Rachel

Cc:

Subject:

Planning Application 2017/0670/P

Follow Up Flag: Flag Status: Follow up Completed

Dear Emily Whittredge

I do hope that you are receiving these emails or at least they are being forwarded by Rachel Stopard's office. I and the above, have yet to hear from you. Are you on holiday? If so, who is your deputy dealing with this case whilst you are away?

I wrote earlier to day about the side extension plans that have been submitted by the architects pointing out that they had not included my garage/workshop or the summerhouse/workshop at 13 Burghley Rd. On reexamination it does appear that they have attempted to include some form of building/structure in the rear gardens of No 9 and 13. I was confused into thinking that it was an attempt to relate the extension to the existing buildings but the drawings are so shoddily inaccurate that it makes one wonder what else is wrong.

- 1. At No 9 Burghley Rd my garage/workshop is **8.7mtrs** from our rear house wall.
- 2. At No 13 Burghley Rd the summerhouse/workshop is 9.3mtrs from their house rear wall
- 3. Both existing & proposed North elevation drawings Nos 1.05 and 2.05 show an un-named structure at **14.5mtrs** from the rear house wall of No 13 Burghley Rd
- 4. Both existing & proposed South elevation drawings Nos 1.06 and 2.06 show an un-named structure at **12.9mtrs** from the rear house wall of No 13 Burghley Rd
- 5. The drawing Nos above show disproportionate larger gardens than actually exist.
- 6. The drawings Nos 1.05 & 2.05 show completely inaccurate roof elevations of what actually exists.
- 7. These drawings are unhelpful, grossly inaccurate and drawn and submitted
 Please, can they be removed from the website and a public apology posted before correct side elevations are posted including the outbuildings, accurately labelled and the roof elevations corrected?
- 8. Please post these comments on the website

Yours faithfully

9 Burghley Rd NW5 1UG