Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Printed on: Response:	30/05/2019	09:10:05
2019/1907/P		29:05/2019 16:03:59	OBJ	We are a neighbouring property and are submitting 2 Comments, and also sending a document and photographs by E Mail. This Comment is the Objection. The second one concerns the significant inc in the application documentation, which misrepresent the proposal. Our OBLECTION relates to the proposed extension which: - Is over-bearing and visually intrusive. - Causes unacceptable harm to our amenity (as neighbours) by way of loss of outlook and increased enclosure. This is especially demonstrated by the photograph we have sent to the Planning Officer, would prefer a site visit to best demonstrate. It relates to the main section of our garden (NOT the pubehind the existing screen, but the next section) which would have significant light block and enclose by the bulk, height and location of this proposed building, being 2 storeys in total. - The existing flat roof (on ground floor) is being used as a patic and overlooks our garden, which is screen was erected sometime in the past. The new flat roof above a proposed first floor extension we create further unacceptable outlook or a screen 3 floors high! -An extension of this height would create a precedent which may enable, in the future, other neighbor properties (including ours) to extend out, 2 storeys high.	but we art directly ure caused why a tall	
2019/1907/P		29.05/2019 16:04:05	OBJ	We are a neighbouring property and are submitting 2 Comments, and also sending a document and photographs by E Mail. This Comment is the Objection. The second one concerns the significant ins in the application documentation, which misrepresent the proposal. Our OBJECTION relates to the proposed extension which: - Is over-bearing and visually intrusive. -Causes unacceptable harm to our amenity (as neighbours) by way of loss of outlook and increased enclosure. This is especially demonstrated by the photograph we have sent to the Planning Officer, would prefer a site visit to best demonstrate. It relates to the main section of our garden (NOT the pbehind the existing screen, but the next section) which would have significant light block and enclose by the bulk, height and location of this proposed building, being 2 storeys in total. -The existing flat roof (on ground floor) is being used as a patio and overlooks our garden, which is screen was eracted sometime in the past. The new flat roof above a proposed first floor extension we create further unacceptable outlook or a screen 3 floors high! -An extension of this height would create a precedent which may enable, in the future, other neighborpoperties (including ours) to extend out, 2 storeys high.	but we art directly ure caused why a tall	

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Printed on: 30/05/2019 09:1 Response:	10:05
2019/1907/P		29/05/2019 16:16:26	OBI	Second Comments (ref Inaccuracies in Documents submitted). We pointed out inaccuracies in an earlier similar application (2018/4369/P) but they have appeared again here. 1) In Design and Access Statement it states that the property is a ground and first floor duplex", whereas it is a first and second floor duplex. 2)Also in the Statement, the proposed extension is described as "ground floor" and it is compared with an approval for another ground floor extension. It is in fact a First Floor extension. 3)In the Drawings, our property (2B Tanza Road, which is neighbouring) is non-existent. It is incorrectly lumped together with the property at 28 Nassington road. I have E mailed an extract from the Land registry to show the true picture.	
				4) The Drawings also describe a temporary trellis at first floor level, between 26C Nassington (the applicant) and ourselves as being a "wall". It is no a wall.	
				These inaccuracies serve to misrepresent the affect on us and a site visit to our garden is requested.	