Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:	Printed on:	10/12/2018	09:10:04
2018/5125/P	D Landes	07/12/2018 22:05:48	OBJ	I wanted to register my opinion that this planning application should be stopped.			
				As a close neighbour, all the houses in the street are of a similar look and age. There level extensions I'm aware of. And I think the large extension proposed, made of different proof) from the houses in the street, would be visible from my bedroom windows and viconsiderably from the other gardens - which are all a similar size and shape.	erent materials	s (e.g. glass	
				Currently there are birds in the gardens which can be heard singing on summer more So if this extension disturbed the wildlife, it would be a real shame.	nings - a rarity	for London.	
				From the planning description, it seems out of character with the rest of the street. The really out of place. I am not clear if it would create any drainage issues or health risks proximity all houses and flats are to each other.			
				Finally, the disruption of the work is also something which will affect a lot of residents something we could do without.	s. The ongoing	noise is	
				My hope is an application of this scale would not be approved.			

Application No: 2018/5125/P	Consultees Name: Z Payne	Received: 08/12/2018 15:42:11	Comment:	Response: would like to submit representations in respect of the above planning application, currently pending consideration by the Council.
				We wish to object to the application in the strongest terms, on the basis that the proposals do not satisfactorily accord with the relevant Development Plan policies or National Planning Guidance.
				? A summary of my objections is outlined below.
				Design and Impact
				? Local Plan Policy D1 (Design) requires development to consider the character, setting, context, form and scale of neighbouring buildings.
				? In this case, there is no other similar form of development within the immediate row of terrace properties of which the application property forms a part, which would justify the scale, width and depth of the extension.
				? The proposal projects beyond the existing built footprint of the host building, with significant works proposed to the rear garden.
				? It has not been possible to assess the full impact of the proposals given the limited drawing information provided.
				? The Applicant has failed to provide any existing sectional drawing material, and it is therefore difficult to properly establish the full extent of excavation that may be required.
				? The design of the extension would contrast uncomfortably with the prevailing pattern of development, to the detriment of the character of the host property and the wider area.
				? The use of materials do not reflect those of the existing building which would add to its incongruous appearance. The development would also be readily apparent in views from neighbouring properties.
				? We note the previous approval for a summer house at the back of the garden (reference 2011/4119/P). When this application was considered, the Council had concerns about the size of the garden that would be retained, and the same considerations apply now. Furthermore, if both propos

					ed on:	10/12/2018	09:10:04
Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:			
2018/5125/P	Z payne	08/12/2018 15:46:09	OBJEMAIL	I am the owner / occupier of $xxxx$, and would like to submit representations in respect of thapplication, currently pending consideration by the Council.	above	planning	
				? We wish to object to the application in the strongest terms, on the basis that the proposal satisfactorily accord with the relevant Development Plan policies or National Planning Guid		ti	
				? A summary of my objections is outlined below.			
				Design and Impact			
				? Local Plan Policy D1 (Design) requires development to consider the character, setting, or scale of neighbouring buildings.	ntext, f	orm and	
				? In this case, there is no other similar form of development within the immediate row of ter which the application property forms a part, which would justify the scale, width and depth of			
				? The proposal projects beyond the existing built footprint of the host building, with significat to the rear garden.	nt work	s proposed	
				? It has not been possible to assess the full impact of the proposals given the limited drawin provided.	g inforr	mation	
				? The Applicant has failed to provide any existing sectional drawing material, and it is there properly establish the full extent of excavation that may be required. ? The design of the extension would contrast uncomfortably with the prevailing pattern of detriment of the character of the host properly and the wider area. ? The use of materials do not reflect those of the existing building which would add to its in appearance. The development would also be readily apparent in views from neighbouring ? We note the previous approval for a summer house at the back of the garden (reference When this application was considered, the Council had concerns about the size of the gard retained, and the same considerations apply now. Furthermore, if both proposals were add be serious overdevelop	evelopm congrue properti 2011/41 en that	nent, to the bus ies. 19/P). would be	

				P	Printed on:	10/12/2018	09:10:04
Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:			
2018/5125/₽	Z Panahlo	08/12/2018 16:49:53	OBJ	representations in respect of the above planning application, currently pending consider We wish to object to the application in the strongest terms, on the basis that the proposa accord with the relevant Development Plan policies or National Planning Guidance. A summary of my objections is outlined below. Design and Impact Local Plan Policy D1 (Design) requires development to consider the character, setting, of neighbouring buildings. In this case, there is no other similar form of development within the immediate row of te which the application property forms a part, which would justify the scale, width and dep The proposal projects beyond the existing built footprint of the host building, with signific the rear garden. It has not been possible to assess the full impact of the proposals given the limited draw provided. The Applicant has failed to provide any existing sectional drawing material, and it is ther properly establish the full extent of excavation that may be required. The design of the extension would contrast uncomfortably with the prevailing pattern of detriment of the character of the host property and the wider area. The use of materials do not reflect those of the existing building which would add to its i appearance. The development would also be readily appearent in views from neighbouring the previous approval for a summer house at the back of the garden (reference this application was considered, the Council had concerns about the size of the garden reference this explication was considered, the Council had concerns about the size of the garden reference this explication was considered, the Council had concerns about the size of the garden reference this explication was considered, the Council had concerns about the size of the garden reference this explication was considered, the Council had concerns about the size of the garden reference the size of the garden reference than application was considered to the council had concerns about the size of the garden reference the same prope	context, for errace proporth of the excant works wing information developme incongruous ing propertie e 2011/411! that would	e Council. m and scale erties of dension. proposed to ation uit to unt, to the s les. g/P/). When be retained,	

				Printed on: 10/12/2018 09:10:04
Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/5125/P	Z Panahlo	08/12/2018 16:36:44	OBJ	would like to submit
				representations in respect of the above planning application, currently pending consideration by the Council.
				? We wish to object to the application in the strongest terms, on the basis that the proposals do not satisfactorily accord with the relevant Development Plan policies or National Planning Guidance. A summary of my objections is outlined below. Design and Impact Local Plan Policy D1 (Design) requires development to consider the character, setting, context, form and scale of neighbouring buildings.
				In this case, there is no other similar form of development within the immediate row of terrace properties of which the application property forms a part, which would justify the scale, width and depth of the extension
				The proposal projects beyond the existing built footprint of the host building, with significant works proposed to the rear carden.
				It has not been possible to assess the full impact of the proposals given the limited drawing information provided.
				The Applicant has failed to provide any existing sectional drawing material, and it is therefore difficult to properly establish the full extent of excavation that may be required
				The design of the extension would contrast uncomfortably with the prevailing pattern of development, to the detriment of the character of the host property and the wider area.
				The use of materials do not reflect those of the existing building which would add to its incongruous appearance. The development would also be readily apparent in views from neighbouring properties.
				? We note the previous approval for a summer house at the back of the garden (reference 2011/4/119/P), When this application was considered, the Council had concerns about the size of the garden that would be retained, and the same considerations apply now. Furthermore, if both proposals were advanced there would be serious.