A	C	Comolton Adda	D	Commente	Filined on: 09/03/2018 09
Application No:	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Consultees Addr:</b>	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/0026/P	Mrs Katherine O'Shaughnessy	21 Rona Road	07/03/2018 15:02:11	OBJ	This proposal lacks neighbourly consideration to a high degree. It shows no respect for the Mansfield Conservation Project, of which it is a part.
		NW3 2HY			The proposal suggests extending the ground floor rear into the garden by as much as three metres. It aims to take away therefore 30 square metres of its garden. This is deleterious to the character of the area, which is heavily defined by the row of gardens at the back of these houses - a row characterised by openness, light, and green. This proposal therefore runs against CA guidelines which stipulate that "Front and rear gardens within the residential streets make an important contribution to the streetscape and character of the residential area. The Council will resist the loss of soft landscaping" - in this sense this proposal is not complying with the recommendations of D2h.
					We as the inhabitants of number 21, directly next door, feel that this proposal lacks all neighbourly consideration, as the proposed building will entail an unpleasant increase in our sense of enclosure and og being overshadowed by our neighbours, resulting in loss of neighbourly amenity and light and outlook, which as we understand it is supposed to be protected (A1a; e and f).
					This proposal, if it is allowed to go ahead in this form, will set an unwelcome precedent for building development within the area of these gardens, which will in turn deprive the neighbourhood of critical aspects of its character. It is both against Mansfield conservation area management strategy, and also against the policies of the Local Plan (D1; D2; A1) as well as to adopted SPD's (CPG Housing and CPG Amenity).
					This proposal will impact us adversely and unpleasantly as immediate neighbours. We will be overlooked by building where there should be garden, where we currently enjoy light and open air.
					We hope that in its current form this unneighbourly proposal will be rejected. Surely, the increase in built footprint is not to be encouraged.