

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/3461/P	Helen Barratt	10/08/2019 12:39:44	OBJ	<p>We wish to raise an objection to the proposed works at no. 5 Lyme Street.</p> <p>The application relies very heavily on the presence of existing extensions, which are considered by the applicants as similar to their proposal.</p> <p>Constant referral to extensions at nos. 7 and 8, that were added 60 years ago as a set of double garages and which are now themselves Grade II listed, as an established 'precedent' to this application is rather feeble.</p> <p>Furthermore, the roof terraces that are now in place at these adjoining properties are a pair, meaning there is symmetry to their appearance to the rear and their presence is not disruptive. Conversely, the proposals for no. 5 will jar with its adjoining property no. 6 which, while benefitting from an extension, does not have a roof terrace. Loss of light and privacy to no. 6 to an unacceptable degree is also inevitable</p> <p>An application was made in 2014 for a larger extension to the lower ground floor at no. 7, which was rejected. Among the grounds for refusal the following statement was included.</p> <p>"In coming to this view I fully accept that the existing addition is lawful and was present when the building was first listed. Therefore, even if it would be a departure from the policies now in place, its presence cannot be questioned.</p> <p>However that does not mean further additions that exacerbated any departure from policy have to be subsequently accepted, and to my mind the cumulative concerns I have raised are valid."</p> <p>An application was made in 2016, to add a bathroom at first floor level, to match that at no. 6, along with a dormer to the existing loft conversion, to match that at nos. 9 and 10. During consultation it was emphasised that existing extensions on neighbouring properties do not set a precedent and that planning policies had changed since those works were carried out. The application was subsequently withdrawn.</p> <p>We feel it is very important that the Planning Department apply consistency to their decisions regarding these listed properties and would like the above to be taken into consideration when reviewing the application.</p> <p>We also note further reference to the planning history of no. 7 as follows:</p> <p>"4.15 The applicants only proposed a single storey side on the lower ground floor, but this is set toward the rear façade in order to remain subservient. This proposal is similar to the works approved at no.7 Lyme Street."</p> <p>It's worth acknowledging here that the approved works have not been carried out at no.7 and there are no plans to do so.</p>