

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/0427/P	Birgit Heyer	97 Torriano Avenue Flat 1	10/04/2018 12:06:00	COMMNT	<p>1) Possible extension of roof terrace area: 95A Torriano Avenue is to be extended to the existing massing of 97 Torriano Avenue. This will create a large flat roofed area which could easily be used as a roof terrace. None of the other adjoining properties have a large roof terrace space but only short projection balconies. Should the new flat roof area created by the extension, be used as a terrace the back of adjoining buildings and gardens could be easily overseen - thus loosing all sense of privacy. It should be stipulated that no part of the extended flat roof is to be used as a terrace, and that the boundary for the terrace that is there at the moment, which is in line with adjoining properties, is not extended onto the newly created flat roof area.</p> <p>2) Boundary wall between 95 and 97 Torriano Avenue: From the plans "Proposed Section F:F - it is shown that the new extension of 95 Torriano - "sits" on the boundary/garden wall of 95/97. This wall is a simple garden wall what kind of foundations does this wall have? Whatever they are, they are surely inadequate to support a building? Will the garden wall be removed and deep foundations dug which are in line of 97? (see also 3)+4) below)</p> <p>3) Attaching the proposed extension of 95A to the existing structure of 97: The extension at 97 Torriano has recently been underpinned with 12 metre deep sheathed piles, supporting a raft and with a deliberate void-space created under the raft to allow the clay soil to expand and contract. The 'proposed plans' show no gap between 97 and 95 Torriano and it would appear that they are looking to attach the extension of 95 to 97. It is important that the foundations for the extension of 95A are sufficient, in particular in this area where movement due to clay soil shrinkage is so pronounced, otherwise this could damage 97 Torriano severely which is now stable.</p> <p>If the proposed extension is not attached to 97 (for example, if it is built inside of the garden wall, on the side of 95), how will development of damp and accumulation of leaves/rubbish be prevented from causing problems in the deep, narrow space between the extension of 95 and 97?</p> <p>4) Boundaries walls and how buildings are connected ie. 95A and 97 From the drawings submitted, proposed and existing, it is not clear how the new extension is to be connected to the existing extension of 97 - the plans show that they are connected but no indication is given as to how.</p> <p>Also if the boundary garden wall is "incorporated" into the proposed structure of 95 ie. the new extensions sits on the boundary wall - this surely cannot be correct?! The wall between 95 and 97 is a shared boundary wall and cannot just be claimed by 95?</p> <p>5) From the plans submitted it is not clear what the proposed height of the new extension is to be. On the "Proposed Section A:A and B:B" the height would appear to be 2570mm where as on "Proposed Section F:F" it is shown to be 3000mm. Which one is correct? In any case it should not be higher then the extension of 97 Torriano Avenue but lower, due to</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

the sloping down/stepping down of the properties/plots ie. 97 is slightly higher then 95.
