

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|-----------|--|
| 2018/4365/P | Deirdre Wright | 06/11/2018 15:57:01 | COMMEMPER | <p>This extensive planning application is objected to for a number of significant reasons. The objections are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Volume added exceeds limits, substantially overbuilding the site - The proposed extension design contravenes the Local Authority design guidance as follows <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Be secondary to the building extended, in terms of location, form, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing; ? The proposed extension is not similar to the existing extension in terms of volume footprint. Instead it far exceeds that volume footprint by its substantial increase in height from its historic one storey extension ? In addition the proposed basement infill is excessive, infilling from the very end of the historic basement extension right across the width of the house ? Both of these design elements means it is of an insensitive scale and represents material variation of the existing property and is as such unsuitable ? In the Supporting Design and Access Statement they cite No 22 and state when designing the new extension we have been aware of the need to contain its overall volume no greater than those at the immediate properties, most notably No. 22. It is misleading and incorrect to state that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ¶ A property has no right to increase its volume footprint because another neighbouring property has a different volume footprint. At No 22 there was a 2 storey extension historically in existence. Great pains were taken not to increase that existing volume footprint (hence the sloped design) and the Local Authority were strict in the adherence to us not increasing that existing volume footprint. At no point could it be asserted by the owners of No 22 that if another property had a greater volume footprint at that time then No 22 could automatically acquire it ¶ At No 22 the infill is not built from the end of the 2 storey extension across the entire width of the house, but instead is set back, or again that would have increased its volume footprint significantly. |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|-------------|--|
| 2018/4365/P | Deirdre Wright | 06/11/2018 15:43:37 | COMMEMA II. | <p>This extensive planning application is objected to for a number of significant reasons. The objections are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">1. Volume added exceeds limits, substantially overbuilding the site. The proposed extension design contravenes the Local Authority design guidance as follows<ul style="list-style-type: none">o Be secondary to the building extended, in terms of location, form, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing;? The proposed extension is not similar to the existing extension in terms of volume footprint. Instead it far exceeds that volume footprint by its substantial increase in height from its historic one storey extension? In addition the proposed basement infill is excessive, infilling from the very end of the historic basement extension right across the width of the house? Both of these design elements means it is of an insensitive scale and represents material variation of the existing property and is as such unsuitable? In the Supporting Design and Access Statement they cite No 22 and state 'when designing the new extension we have been aware of the need to contain its overall volume no greater than those at the immediate properties, most notably No. 22'. It is misleading and incorrect to state that<ul style="list-style-type: none">¶ A property has no right to increase its volume footprint because another neighbouring property has a different volume footprint. At No 22 there was an existing 2 storey extension historically in existence. Great pains were taken not to increase that existing volume footprint (hence the sloped design) and the Local Authority were strict in the adherence to us not increasing that existing volume footprint. At no point could it be asserted by the owners of No 22 that if another property had a greater volume footprint at that time then No 22 could automatically acquire it¶ At No 22 the infill is not built from the end of the 2 storey extension across the entire width of the house, but instead is set back, or again that would have increased its volume footprint signifi |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|----------|-----------|
| 2018/4365/P | Helen Fielding | 09/11/2018 16:42:29 | APP | |

9th November 2018

MY OBJECTIONS TO THE PLANNING PERMISSION APPLICATION FOR NUMBER 21 SMC
I have 4 serious objections that I would like logged with the Planning Department.

1. Loss of light to my property

I will experience a loss of light issue because my one storey basement extension has a glass roof (it is a traditional Victorian style conservatory extension) which will be oppressive and caused by the substantial increase in the height of the party wall. The current party wall is quite low. Our extension is our family living space and is the most used communal space in our home.

2. Light pollution for us and our neighbours

The rear basement extension skylight plus the volume of glass across the entire width of the rear extension and the 2 storey extension must all be considered individually and as a mass for the level of light pollution they may cause. I am concerned about the consequences of so much glass and the light pollution issue and the skylight shining up affecting the back bedroom windows at night of my childrens bedrooms. I believe the permission granted to number 23 SMC illustrates this.

3. Overbuilding of the site at number 21 SMC

I understand that the additional storey rear extension and the entire width basement extension exceed what the property is entitled to add in terms of an extension and therefore is an overbuilding of the property.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely

Helen Fielding
