

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1946/P	Jack Grimston	First floor flat 48 Compayne Gardens	08/06/2017 10:40:54	INT	<p>I am requesting that this application be rejected. If the council is not minded to reject it outright, I am requesting that the council tells the applicant to resubmit it before it can be considered.</p> <p>It is not reasonable to expect residents to comment in an informed way on the application as currently submitted.</p> <p>It is so badly drawn up and confusing that it is not possible to determine what the application is actually for-- a new extension or a detached bungalow in the garden (misleadingly described as a "garden room").</p> <p>Is it for one or the other or both?</p> <p>The application form makes no mention of the detached building. But the design statement does. It wrongly claims that permission has been granted for such a building already, when in fact it was refused. It also includes no detailed drawings for this accommodation building.</p> <p>The statement switches confusingly between talking about the extension and the "garden room".</p> <p>If the proposal for the detached building is being resubmitted, my objections remain the same as previously. In summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Destruction of much-valued green space, contrary to the policy for the conservation area. --the building is in effect a new flat/bungalow not a room and has its own water and electricity supply. It could easily turn into a new flat and appears to be separate, not ancillary accommodation. -loss of privacy. The glass-fronted building would look directly into my bedroom and kitchen on the first floor of Number 48. --worrying precedent of allowing gardens in the conservation area to be lost to new detached buildings. --unsympathetic design (though the design is left to guesswork in the application). -lack of provision to ensure stability of the party wall between numbers 58 and 50. --light pollution from the glass-fronted building; noise from comings and goings to the new flat. <p>If the application is not in fact for the new bungalow but for a new and bigger extension, It</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1946/P	C. Decaestecker	Flat4 50 Compayne Gardens	08/06/2017 10:47:39	OBJ	<p>needs to show explicitly how this proposal differs from the application that has already been granted. Instead, it details how the proposed building differs from the existing extension, which is no longer so relevant as permission has already been given for an extension.</p> <hr/> <p>The proposed plans attached in this new application 2017/1946/P are not in line with what is described in the Design and Access statement.pdf document. The Title and Description of this new application are also not in line with the Design document.</p> <p>The title and the proposed plans refer and show the initial proposed plans of the new extension, which had been granted with the planning application 2017/0081/P, whereas the design document refers to the garden detached room, which has been already refused with the 2017/0089/P planning application.</p> <p>Was it deliberate to mislead the public here and to hide the purpose of this new planning application?</p> <p>I strongly ask a rejection of this new planning application as there is lots of misleading information in it that could be interpreted in a wrong way in a near future. The detached garden house planning application has been firmly refused and that previous decision must prevail with this new application.</p> <hr/>