

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/6397/P	Mrs L George	02/03/2020 22:22:00	OBJ	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed planning application 2019/6397/P</p> <p>1)the proposed roof terrace has already been proposed before- 2016/5069/P It was refused 02/02/17 Appeal dismissed 27/4/17 - But a retrospective - as already built out- proposal 2017/6848/P - rear dormer roof extension plus 'pod' roof extension above part of the 2 storey rear addition . Refused 10/5/18 but allowed on Appeal 14/10/18. -The roof terrace too has been refused and dismissed before but No.34 decided to ignore this so went ahead and built it. After an enforcement complaint it was removed I am surprised this is being brought up again.</p> <p>2) This proposal is for a 2nd floor terrace above the 2 storey outrigger and as shown in the photos in this proposal which this proposal appears to want to copy. - the photos show the dominance of the 'pod in the visible setting of this site. -it shows the terrace at the edge of the 2 storey outrigger - using the remaining roof area not already used by the pod. - the photos also show that No 34's terrace is built on a platform making it higher than others on the north side of Ingham Road which have steps going down from their door to terrace. All the above points in section 2 show the proposed terrace will enabling it to overlook neighbours to the east, west and north.</p> <p>3) it should be noted there are very few roof terraces on the north side of Ingham Rd and the south side of Weech Rd. - Ingham RD north side has over 40 living unit of flats and houses only 4 terraces are mentioned which I assume are meant to be show terraces comparable with No34's proposal -mentioned and pictured - Nos.16 and 18 are at the far end and have steps leading down to their terraces to make them less conspicuous, unlike 34 which had raised theres. - No.28 does not have a terrace but has railings directly abutting their windows. - No 36 is small and uses very, very little of the roof area it is built on and is built on 1st floor level. - Out of 6 mentioned mentioned on the south side of Weech Rd, which has over 25 living unit of flats and houses, - 2 are at 1st floor level not 2nd floor as No.34 proposes - one has railings abutting the windows so is not a terrace - one has a one foot step out from door to railings and 2 have half roof width terraces. The inspector noted Page 2 point 7 - '2nd floor roof terraces are relatively uncommon in the visible setting of this site.' As you can se from the above point they still are today.</p> <p>4)'Boundary planting' is more like borrowed greenery not growing in No.34 and will not disguise the proposed terrace 'or loss of privacy to from neighbours into the rear in Weech Rd' as suggested page7 - 4.15 -as the proposed terrace is so high. There is an assumption that mature trees which currently shelter some neighbours from the proposed roof terrace, during the summer months, will always be there. One of the 2 closest is being watched closely as it has dying branches and sadly may need to be removed. Several trees have died in the last 18months in the gardens of Weech and Ingham Roads further reducing coverage. Loss of privacy to many of No 34s neighbours will ensue if this roof terrace is given permission to be built as it looks down and across to many of us.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p data-bbox="875 161 2000 277">5)Page 3 section5 of the CPG1 'Identifies that balconies and terraces can provide valuable amenity space. However this is explicitly for flats that would otherwise have little or no private exterior space.' This does not apply to No 34 as it is a family house with a very nice rear garden as shown in photo in the Background section by point 2.6</p> <p data-bbox="875 316 2040 491">6) in the application it says 'this is a secondary amenity space would be used less frequently and by fewer people.' As already pointed out in point 5, No. 34 already has a garden at ground level. it also so has extended out and upward. I has a large pod on the 2nd floor and the addition of a a terrace, filling the rest of any roof area left of the outrigger roof ,would add to the dominance, the impact, of the pod and overlook many neighbours on 3 sides.</p> <p data-bbox="875 529 2045 587">Finally, I am surprised this is being proposed again after it has already been refused by many planners and the refusal ignored. For all the above reasons i strongly object to this proposal .</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/6397/P	Mrs L George	02/03/2020 22:21:36	OBJ	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed planning application 2019/6397/P</p> <p>1)the proposed roof terrace has already been proposed before- 2016/5069/P It was refused 02/02/17 Appeal dismissed 27/4/17 - But a retrospective - as already built out- proposal 2017/6848/P - rear dormer roof extension plus 'pod' roof extension above part of the 2 storey rear addition . Refused 10/5/18 but allowed on Appeal 14/10/18. -The roof terrace too has been refused and dismissed before but No.34 decided to ignore this so went ahead and built it. After an enforcement complaint it was removed I am surprised this is being brought up again.</p> <p>2) This proposal is for a 2nd floor terrace above the 2 storey outrigger and as shown in the photos in this proposal which this proposal appears to want to copy. - the photos show the dominance of the 'pod in the visible setting of this site. -it shows the terrace at the edge of the 2 storey outrigger - using the remaining roof area not already used by the pod. - the photos also show that No 34's terrace is built on a platform making it higher than others on the north side of Ingham Road which have steps going down from their door to terrace. All the above points in section 2 show the proposed terrace will enabling it to overlook neighbours to the east, west and north.</p> <p>3) it should be noted there are very few roof terraces on the north side of Ingham Rd and the south side of Weech Rd. - Ingham RD north side has over 40 living unit of flats and houses only 4 terraces are mentioned which I assume are meant to be show terraces comparable with No34's proposal -mentioned and pictured - Nos.16 and 18 are at the far end and have steps leading down to their terraces to make them less conspicuous, unlike 34 which had raised theres. - No.28 does not have a terrace but has railings directly abutting their windows. - No 36 is small and uses very, very little of the roof area it is built on and is built on 1st floor level. - Out of 6 mentioned mentioned on the south side of Weech Rd, which has over 25 living unit of flats and houses, - 2 are at 1st floor level not 2nd floor as No.34 proposes - one has railings abutting the windows so is not a terrace - one has a one foot step out from door to railings and 2 have half roof width terraces. The inspector noted Page 2 point 7 - '2nd floor roof terraces are relatively uncommon in the visible setting of this site.' As you can se from the above point they still are today.</p> <p>4)'Boundary planting' is more like borrowed greenery not growing in No.34 and will not disguise the proposed terrace 'or loss of privacy to from neighbours into the rear in Weech Rd' as suggested page7 - 4.15 -as the proposed terrace is so high. There is an assumption that mature trees which currently shelter some neighbours from the proposed roof terrace, during the summer months, will always be there. One of the 2 closest is being watched closely as it has dying branches and sadly may need to be removed. Several trees have died in the last 18months in the gardens of Weech and Ingham Roads further reducing coverage. Loss of privacy to many of No 34s neighbours will ensue if this roof terrace is given permission to be built as it looks down and across to many of us.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p data-bbox="875 161 2000 277">5)Page 3 section5 of the CPG1 'Identifies that balconies and terraces can provide valuable amenity space. However this is explicitly for flats that would otherwise have little or no private exterior space.' This does not apply to No 34 as it is a family house with a very nice rear garden as shown in photo in the Background section by point 2.6</p> <p data-bbox="875 316 2040 491">6) in the application it says 'this is a secondary amenity space would be used less frequently and by fewer people.' As already pointed out in point 5, No. 34 already has a garden at ground level. it also so has extended out and upward. I has a large pod on the 2nd floor and the addition of a a terrace, filling the rest of any roof area left of the outrigger roof ,would add to the dominance, the impact, of the pod and overlook many neighbours on 3 sides.</p> <p data-bbox="875 529 2045 585">Finally, I am surprised this is being proposed again after it has already been refused by many planners and the refusal ignored. For all the above reasons i strongly object to this proposal .</p>
