
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 February 2020 09:04
To: Whittredge, Emily
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: 2019/6139/P

Dear Ms Whittredge,

Re planning application 2019/6139/P

Thank you for your telephone call last week. As I have not heard further as to whether the application is being withdrawn I thought it best to outline objections.

Please note that I formally object to the above planning application which is made by our neighbour, [REDACTED], who currently lives in the ground floor Flat A 44 Ferncroft Avenue.

We live at [REDACTED] Ferncroft Avenue. My grounds of objection are summarised below.

As you know 44 Ferncroft is a property divided into flats. Since the previous planning application Mr Kulick has I understand purchased Flat C on the first floor and another flat. This leaves two remaining apartments in separate ownership.

1. The project appears to be dramatically wider in scope than the previous plan for which Mr Kulick obtained planning several years ago. Aside from upgrading his office roof at the far side of the building to us that planning consent has not been visibly implemented. Accordingly, this new application will I trust be determined afresh and on its merits.
2. We are very concerned about subsidence risk. This is a two fold issue (a) the impact on our house from the works, in particular from the excavation and any work to the rear wall and (b) the structural integrity of 44.
3. As Mr Kulick is proposing to amalgamate the ground floor flat with the one above we query the necessity of a basement excavation as he would have now space for accommodation above ground.
4. In 2017 a bore hole was dug in the front garden of 44. A gentleman digging the hole referred to subsidence. The issue of subsidence, both historical and future, should be carefully examined.
5. Water run off is an ancillary concern if the footprint of the property is enlarged or if any tree is removed.
6. The scheme includes construction of a rear extension and separate property. We regard these elements as over development in relation to the size of the property and the site.
7. At present we enjoy our garden without being overlooked. It is delightfully secluded. Were a large one - two storey structure to be built out onto the rear of 44 into the garden our privacy would be eroded.
8. Any rear extension would impact on light entering the back of our house and onto our terrace and garden. The effect of the works will be particularly acute given the north east orientation of the properties. This would further adversely affect our enjoyment of our home and garden.

9. Logistically, we do not understand how large equipment could be brought into the rear garden of 44 given that the only side passage is on our side and is narrow. We query too whether large equipment could be brought through the front door. We would not consent to our fence being removed in order to facilitate access to equipment as we do not wish to incur the inconvenience or have our security compromised. Indeed, the passage would doubtless be made narrower as a protective fence would be needed to be erected in the event of works to save our fence from being damaged.

10. As a further matter of practicality and health and safety the entire site would surely need to be fenced off. How could this be achieved when there are residents in situ? The need to cordon off the site is enhanced given the proximity of St Margaret's school opposite and other pedestrian traffic along Ferncroft. When St Margaret's school removed and replaced a class room last summer they ensured that the entire building site was properly fenced.

11. The works would be entirely inappropriate in any event but particularly now when there are other residents in situ.

12.. The appearance of the property would be fundamentally altered and jar with the quaint aspect of the rest of the side of the street and area.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]