

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1684/P	Lars Holskjaer	17/04/2019 17:49:13	OBJ	<p>The application is submitted as a Householder Application. However 108 Fitzjohn's is not a house -- it is a multi-unit building. Hence application should be for full planning permission. The previous application at the site should render this obvious (ref: 2018/5027/P).</p> <p>Regarding Section 4 -- Description of Proposed Works, whether work already been started without consent? Applicant has ticked no, but the work clearly has started. We alerted Planning Enforcement of this with a photo around 20 March.</p> <p>Regarding Section 5 Materials. Applicant says walls are to be built from stock brick to match house, but the wall that you can already see is block work. The block work wall sticks above the garden wall and this cannot be easily over-clad.</p> <p>If this were to be permitted development (which it is not) the height of the whole height of the building (and the eaves) should be 2.5m measured from the highest point on the side of 108 Fitzjohn's. It also should not exceed the height of the historic boundary wall to 14 Prince Arthur Road -- the full line of the wall including curved brickwork should be visible. The building seems too tall based on these criteria.</p> <p>The application has to be read in conjunction with the previous application (2018/5027/P), regarding planning permission for an extension to the house (granted). No document accompanying any of the two planning applications shows the full impact on the garden, and this is probably not a coincidence. The extension to the house appear to take up some 5 meter of the garden, and the same appears to be the case for the "garden room". If both are permitted, the garden will pretty much be completely built out, resulting in little or no amenity space.</p>
