

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Consultees Addr:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2017/1946/P	Gillian M Cracknell	Flat 5 50 Compayne Gardens London NW6 3RY	07/06/2017 22:51:39	OBJ	I do not agree to this going ahead. There has been no discussion with the 4 other freeholders, detailing the joint financial implications of this new division of our property. Clarity is severely lacking on several fronts, namely whether as before, amendments are going to be permitted AFTER we have raised our concerns, giving us no opportunity for adjustments as well.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1946/P	Christophe Decaestecker	Flat4 50 Compayne Gardens	07/06/2017 17:25:07	OBJ	<p>There is already a previous fully granted permission (Application 2017/0081/P) similar to this new planning permission.</p> <p>This is a bit confusing to me. Indeed the previous application had the same proposed plans than those included here according to what we could see before the deadline for adding comments in the previous application. Then some revised plans had been added in the application after the deadline for adding any new comments. It was not clear if the approval of that application was granted for the initial proposed plans or the revised plans delivered afterwards.</p> <p>Does this new planning application 2017/1946/P replace the previous one then? How can we make sure that new revised plans would not be introduced in the same way than before, meaning after the deadline for adding comments? If the plans attached here are the ones that the owner want to finally implement, then my previous comments and objections remain the same:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Privacy issue Most of the big folding windows doors of the extension would be directly facing the above living room windows flats and also facing directly the back of the number 52 property windows and their extension. I consider that planning as intrusive for the current existing privacy. I would request and expect that most the folding windows to be facing the garden instead in order to avoid the privacy issue with the direct neighbours.</li> <li>2) Size of the extension How far can the extension can be extended into the back garden? Is there any minimal distance to be respect between the new extension planned with the wall shared with the property number 48? The overlooking view of the beautiful back garden will be diminished drastically by the size of the extended new extension.</li> <li>3) Ownership of the maintenance of the roof of the extended extension As said before, the property number 50 is a shared of freehold. The current roof maintenance of the ground floor flat extension is managed/funded by the freeholders of the property. It belongs to the owner of the ground floor flat to decide to remove and rebuild the current extension, but because the size of the new roof extension will be much bigger and in a different nature, it does not seem correct to me that the 4 other freeholders owning 80% of the shares will have no say about this plan and the future cost of maintenance of the new roof extension. I would expect the maintenance of the roof of the new extension to be fully funded in the future by the owner of the ground floor flat then.</li> </ol> <p>For the above reasons, I object in the same way and would request discussions, clarifications and amendments before a new application could be submitted.</p>

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"> <li>-Destruction of much-valued green space, contrary to the policy for the conservation area.</li> <li>--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.</li> <li>-loss of privacy. The glass-fronted building would look directly into my bedroom and kitchen on the first floor of Number 48.</li> <li>--worrying precedent of allowing gardens in the conservation area to be lost to new detached buildings.</li> <li>--unsympathetic design (though the design is left to guesswork in the application).</li> <li>-lack of provision to ensure stability of the party wall between numbers 58 and 50.</li> <li>--light pollution from the glass-fronted building; noise from comings and goings to the new flat.</li> </ul> <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/>