Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Printed on: 03/02/2020 09 Response:	9:10:09
2019/6354/P	Consumers Ivalie.	02/02/2020 17:56:15	OBJ	The proposed extension is not only a lot bigger then the existing 1970s extension, it is five times the size of the original Edwardian building. Its many turrets and fake chimneys dominate the site and eclipse the host building. This contravenes design guidelines for extensions in Conservation Areas.	
				The owners of these flats will not be allowed residents; parking. Only 5 proposed parking places for the 34 new flats in the development is insufficient. Although plenty bicycle parking places are proposed too, it; unlikely that most owners of these flats would forgo their cars for bicycles. A transport strategy like this for a development of this type will cause havoc on the surrounding roads.	
				It is proposed that the 7 affordable flats are to be provided elsewhere. These entirely luxury developments, the kind which already exists around the area, do very little for the local neighbourhood. The absentee owners don; t partake in the communities, the local business loose their customers and the combined effect is an unsustainable neighbourhood.	
2019/6354/P		03/02/2020 08:18:28	COMMNT	1 Design and size: a large sprawling development replaces the current smallish 1970s block. This new extension is not only considerably bigger then the 1970s block, it is actually five times the size of the original Edwardian building. Its many turrets and fake chimneys dominate and rather eclipse the host building. This contravenes design guidelines for extending buildings in Conservation Areas.	
				2 Affordability: developer proposes that the 7 affordable flats required for a development of this size (total of 34 new flats) should be located elsewhere - the service charge he plans to charge would make them unaffordable. We locals know full well what happens in developments without affordable flats - there are plenty examples within walking distance of Branch Hill - they are ghostly places with little life in them.	
				3 Parking only 5 parking places are proposed to service the 34 new flats in the development. The owners of these flats will not be allowed residents; parking. Although 70 bicycle places are proposed too, I wonder if most owners of these luxury flats would easily swap cars for bicycles. I think this is a rather naive transport strategy for a development of this type, in this location. I think that our surrounding roads will take the toll of this.	
				4. We have small children living in the adjacent road, this development will fundamentally change the area, with denser accommodation, many more cars, which the roads can not cope with.	
				5. We would strongly urge you to decline this application.	

				Printed on: 03/02/2020 0	09:10:09
Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:	
2019/6354/P		02/02/2020 19:01:05	OBJ	I am disappointed by this proposal as it looks overbearing and inconsiderate of the rather attractive original Edwardian building. Although I am not a fan of the 1970s block, I would question the wisdom of raising it to the ground. The large replacement sits exactly in the same location so should be possible to reuse it and extend upwards instead? It seems that only 5 parking places are proposed to service this development and that no residents; parking are to be be issued to the new owners. I understand that 70 bicycle places are proposed too, but I wonder if many owners of these flats are likely to swap their cars for bicycles? I am afraid that instead, our surrounding roads will become congested with parking from the owners and visitors of this development.	