

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/2220/P	Ronald Victor Woodworth	28/06/2019 05:50:19	INT	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>1. I strongly object to such a high building (2.75m) on ground that already has been artificially raised by 2 or 3 feet.</p> <p>2. I further object that it is proposed to extend it right up to my boundary (as was so speedily approved without a meeting at which I could be heard) with the rear extension to 162 two years ago.</p> <p>With regard to 1</p> <p>The amount of clay excavated supposedly just from the rear extension, even after tamping down raised 160's garden 2 or 3 feet necessitating a concrete wall below the fence to retain it (not shown in the original plans). A 2.75m building on top of this from which to view the wealth of greenery provided by the neighbourhood (but not by 162 who, with approval, cut down every tree and plant in their domain and laid plastic grass) will be obtrusive and intrusive. It will be an eyesore (presumably plastic) spoiling everyone else's enjoyment of the presently still abundant greenery and it will specifically intrude on the privacy I currently enjoy in my conservatory and garden. It should be lower or the ground could be excavated down 2 or 3 feet or both.</p> <p>With regard to 2</p> <p>Building up to the boundary means</p> <p>a) That for external maintenance in subsequent years the residents of 162 will have the right to demand access to my property (their surveyor gleefully told me this about the rear extension) even cutting any plants that might manage to grow near it.</p> <p>b) If I want a rear extension, or garden room I will have to settle for buildings several feet from the boundary - this is just unfair. When in the 1980s a previous occupant of 162 and I built conservatories we both left space in our own gardens for cleaning and maintenance. I was not able to suggest this for the extension because there was no hearing (your planning officer said it was nodded through because there was only 1 objection!</p> <p>3 The lie of the land (and drainage) means my garden (downhill from 166, 168 etc now spends long periods as a</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/2220/P	Ronald Victor Woodworth	28/06/2019 05:49:30	INT	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>1. I strongly object to such a high building (2.75m) on ground that already has been artificially raised by 2 or 3 feet.</p> <p>2. I further object that it is proposed to extend it right up to my boundary (as was so speedily approved without a meeting at which I could be heard) with the rear extension to 162 two years ago.</p> <p>With regard to 1</p> <p>The amount of clay excavated supposedly just from the rear extension, even after tamping down raised 160's garden 2 or 3 feet necessitating a concrete wall below the fence to retain it (not shown in the original plans). A 2.75m building on top of this from which to view the wealth of greenery provided by the neighbourhood (but not by 162 who, with approval, cut down every tree and plant in their domain and laid plastic grass) will be obtrusive and intrusive. It will be an eyesore (presumably plastic) spoiling everyone else's enjoyment of the presently still abundant greenery and it will specifically intrude on the privacy I currently enjoy in my conservatory and garden. It should be lower or the ground could be excavated down 2 or 3 feet or both.</p> <p>With regard to 2</p> <p>Building up to the boundary means</p> <p>a) That for external maintenance in subsequent years the residents of 162 will have the right to demand access to my property (their surveyor gleefully told me this about the rear extension) even cutting any plants that might manage to grow near it.</p> <p>b) If I want a rear extension, or garden room I will have to settle for buildings several feet from the boundary - this is just unfair. When in the 1980s a previous occupant of 162 and I built conservatories we both left space in our own gardens for cleaning and maintenance. I was not able to suggest this for the extension because there was no hearing (your planning officer said it was nodded through because there was only 1 objection!</p> <p>3 The lie of the land (and drainage) means my garden (downhill from 166, 168 etc now spends long periods as a</p>
