Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Printed on: 25/07/2017 09:10:02 Response:
2017/3457/P	N Ibrahim	4 Hargraves Place London N7 0BP	19/07/2017 21:38:49	OBJEMAIL	I strongly object to this application. My property will be the one most negatively impacted by the proposed plans. As a basement my property already has light limitations and this proposed development would make it un-inhabitable and eliminate my right to light. I have received no notice and came to know about this application, when a neighbour kindly informed me. At no time has the applicant attempted to consult with me about this proposed development. I request that numbers 27-37 Brecknock Road are informed, as they will also be disadvantaged by this proposal. This proposed development is an overdevelopment of this site. it is likely to increase the number of occupants, and thus lead to an increase in foot traffic past our front door and bedroom. This will directly impact us negatively through noise elevation and privacy damage. The proposed additional window and staircase light well will cause overlooking and privacy issues, alongside light pollution. No allowances have been made for the provision of additional refuge storage and parking, let alone fire safety concerns. It is worth noting that this is development is not in keeping with the area. More worryingly is that the existing plans submitted are not accurate.
2017/3457/P	MANISH PATEL	10 WASDALE DRIVE GATLEY SK8 4RT	24/07/2017 21:35:22	OBJ	I STRONGLY OBJECT TO THIS EXTENSION AS IT WOULD RESULT IN OVER DEVELOPMENT IN THE AREA AND THE BACK ENTRANCE HAS WILL RESULT IN LIMITED AMENITY SPACE. It is worth noting that this is development is not in keeping with the area. More worryingly is that the existing plans submitted are not accurate.
2017/3457/P	peter sanquest	6 camden terrace london nw19bp nw19bp nw19bp	23/07/2017 19:02:13	COMMNT	As the owner of the flat 1,2a Hargrave place I would like to express my concern for the proposed plans.My flat is extremely small and with an already extremely limited view making an already quite claustrophobic flat even more so.Also the natural light source will be affected by the proposed building-obviously depending on the position of the sun and the season, compromising what little light is available to windows at the back of the flat and the hallway area.I am also perturbed at the limited amount of time available to comment about this situation.Yours sincerely ,Peter Sanquest.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3457/P	Joanna Pope	Flat 1 2a Hargrave Place	18/07/2017 18:00:18	COMMEM PER	Proposed 2 Hargrave rear extension
		n70bp		I LK	Planning App 2017/3457/P
					I'm the current tenant of flat 1, 2a Hargrave Place.
					I have been living in this property for the past two years and I intend to remain here for the foreseeable future.
					I have studied the proposed planning application building plans for the erection of a single storey first floor extension at the rear of my flat and I feel it would have a negative impact on my view and rights of light.
					I appreciate there is a '25 degree projection from the centre of my window', however, this is in place to 'minimise overbearing and intrusion on rights of light'.
					So therefore, as I understand it, it will still profoundly impact me and any future occupant of Flat 1.
					Flat 1 is a very small flat.
					Last year a four storey building was built opposite my residence at the front of my building on the other side of the road replacing a single storey light industrial unit.
					This has impacted on the amount of light in my flat and I rely on the back window where the extension is proposed to be built for extra light.
					Furthermore, the light to all the hallway windows will be blocked significantly.
					I understand Mr Woolf as the Freeholder owns the communal hallway to my flat and the 2 above.
					I'm also very concerned about having no view from my back window and feeling boxed in.
					I already feel this from the flats opposite and having a wall at the back of the property would significantly add to this.
					Presently with the glass pitched roof of the rear extension as it currently is I can see beyond and around. I can see trees and back yards and even Hampstead Heath in the distance. If the proposed building goes ahead my only view at the back will be the "green" wall. And it will only remain green if it is rigorously maintained for perpetuity. Which I strongly doubt.

Obviously having a green wall is aesthetically more attractive than a brick one, if the wall is Page 41 of 80

Printed on: 25/07/2017

09:10:02

Application No.	Consultees Maine.	Consulces Auur.	Ketelveu.	Comment.	Kesponse.
					maintained.
					I must add I was rather surprised at the limited time given to respond to this Planning Application.
					10 days doesn't seem long enough to me, and considering this is when most people are away on holiday I think this whole process is being undertaken in an unacceptable way.
					I also want to make it clear I'm not completely against Mr Woolf building his extension but I'm concerned about the issues I've raised with the plans as they currently stand.
_					If the additional floor area was only at the rear of the rear extension the impact on my flat and others around me might be significantly mitigated