
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 28 June 2019 09:24
To: Planning
Subject: 2019/2220/p 162 Goldhurst Terrace

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Sirs, I attempted to submit these comments last night using the official form but it did not work although your online advice said it would be ok till 9am. Thus, I am re-sending them by e-mail to you (and I will copy in "the planning officer" if I can find how to do that).

Re: Erection of garden room to rear of 162 Goldhurst Terrace (2019/2220/p)

I am an interested party, I live at [REDACTED] (since 1972). I would like to be informed of any relevant meetings. My phone number is 0207 624 2518

I have two comments about the structure as proposed and a third general observation.

1. The proposed structure is needlessly high (2.75m) and on ground that has already been artificially raised by 2 or 3 feet.
2. It is proposed that it should extend right up to my boundary. (As was also the case with the rear extension so speedily approved 2 years ago when I did not get to speak at the promised meeting because, I was told, there was only one objection so a discussion was considered unnecessary!)

With regard to 1:

The amount of clay excavated supposedly just from the rear extension excavations, even after mechanical compacting raised 162's rear garden by 2 or 3 feet and necessitated concrete walls below the fence (not in the original plans) to retain it. A 2.75m building on top of this from which to view the green sward provided by the neighbourhood (but not by 162 who, with approval, cut down every tree or shrub in their own domain and laid plastic grass) will be a) obtrusive and b) intrusive.

- 1a. It will be an eyesore (presumably plastic) spoiling everyone else's view and enjoyment of the previously mentioned greenery we are so lucky to have in this road.
- 1b. It will intrude on the privacy I currently enjoy in my conservatory and back garden.

I suggest it should be substantially lower or the ground be excavated by the previously mentioned 2 or 3 feet (or both).

With regard to 2:

Building up to the boundary means that:

2a. For inspection, cleaning and maintenance the residents of 162 will have a legal right to demand entry to my property (as their surveyors gleefully informed me with regard to the extension). They presumably will even be able to cut down any plants of mine that may be in their way.

2b. If I ever want an extension or a garden room it or they will not be able to extend as far... 162 will have seized that aspect of my rights over my property. Put simply, this is unfair.

When, in the 1980s, a previous resident of 162 and I both added conservatories we built them far enough from the fence that we would never need to impose on each other.

I suggest a similar rule for this structure.

3. The lie of the land (affecting drainage) in Goldhurst means I am downhill from 166, 168 and so on. (about a foot per house). I am now the low point and my garden is frequently and for long periods a lake. I will not be trying to grow grass anyway for a while because the mature trees I had near the fence are one by one falling right across my garden and growing horizontally. Presumably their roots were victims of the excavations.

What a joy to have property developers for neighbours.

