					Printed on: 04/07/2017 09:10:02		
Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:		
2017/2646/P	Enid RUBENS	3 Bacon`s Lane Highgate Village London N66BL	02/07/2017 15:48:34	COMMNT	I object on same grounds as previously. See on your file Comments Form and my letter19 September 2013 to the Highways Management Team re Construction Management Plan 5 Bacon`s Lane		
2017/2646/P	Alan Yuille	3701 st paul street Baltimore MD 21218 USA	02/07/2017 21:43:57	OBJLETTE R	I am the co-owner of No. 4 Bacons Lane. I am very concerned that constructions plans for No. 5 will be extremely inconvenient for our tenants. The construction plans indicate two vehicles parked outside the garage of No. 5 and No. 4 respectively. The vehicle outside No. 4 appears to be a delivery van. When parked there, it would make access to No. 4 only possible for a small car, no larger vehicle (such as an ambulance) could reach it. The vehicle outside No.5 looks like a Telehandler. When present, this would block the designated turning area in the Lane (the Lane is shaped like an L). But this designated turning area should not be blocked at any time, as stated in the Lane regulations. Moreover, if the delivery van is unloading onto the Telehandler, then no cars will be able to get in or out from No. 4. No. 5 is extremely close to No 4 and is less than two yards apart at the site of the proposed extension. So any work done at weekends would unreasonably affect our tenants.		
					Prof. A.L. Yuille alan.I.yuille@gmail.com		

					Printed on: 04/07/2017 09:		
Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:		
2017/2646/P	Dr Pam Yuille	10 East underton Underton Bridgnorth WV16 6TY WV16 6TY	02/07/2017 19:02:39	OBJLETTE R	E My brother & I own No 4 Bacons Lane and are very concerned about problems likely to arise during the above proposed construction process. Our three tenants will have unacceptable access difficulties and suffer unacceptable noise and inconvenience.		
					The plans state "access retained into garage of No 4 Bacon"s Lane" but showing this as barely wide enough for a car to pass and with a huge Delivery vehicle parked on the side of the Lane at the bottom of No 3"s garden, unloading material onto a Telehandler, parked in the hammerhead.		
					A constant stream of such Delivery vehicles unloading onto Telehandlers is proposed and No 4 will be hemmed in.		
					The area shown as occupied by the huge Delivery vehicle is for the shared co-operative use of all houses in the Lane, not reserved for No 5.		
					No 4 also needs to be accessible by Delivery vehicles or Tradesmens" vehicles, wider than a car, but there is no provision for this.		
					And on the very frequent occasions when a Delivery vehicle is unloading onto a Telehandler, parked as shown in the hammerhead, neither our own cars nor any other vehicle visiting No 4 will be able to get in or out. This would be unacceptable at any time & could even be dangerous if emergency services were to be delayed.		
					There is reference to vehicles being parked in front of No.5's garage but that is part of the		
					lane & the designated turning area for all vehicles using the lane and it should not be obstructed at any time, as is clearly stated in our deeds.		
					A car coming from our garage at No 4 has got to be able to turn there, as it has always done, before proceeding up Bacon's Lane to South Grove: there is no room to turn anywhere else & it would be unacceptably dangerous as well as illegal to reverse out into South Grove.		
					The weight of the vehicles delivering materials to the site & skips removing waste is going to damage Bacons Lane.		
					All the houses in the lane have to share the cost of maintaining this private road. Can the plan be amended to include a weight restriction such as 20 tons?		
					I believe that this was the weight restriction when No 6 & No 7 were built.		
					No 4 shares a long boundary with No 5 and we wish to make it quite clear that under no circumstances will we grant access onto our land for the purpose of carrying out this building project.		
					Most of the boundary is delineated by a post and rail fence which is our property & was erected by us on our land.		
					We wish to be assured that this fence will not be damaged in any way during the building work.		
					We object to Saturday afternoon and Sunday work and indeed consider Saturday morning work to be unreasonable as the wall of our house will be less than two yards from the site of		

work to be unreasonable as the wall of our house will be less than two yards from the site of Page 12 of 31

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:	
					No 5's extension & this is a residential area. 2.7.2017	