Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/5709/P	Vincent Wong	10/09/2020 08:26:08	OBJ	We, the owners of House 1G Parsifal Road, object to this planning application as revised. The revision proposed in the latest application does not address any of the concerns we previously raised on our objection filed on 20 Dec 2019. All the points in that objection therefore remain valid and are hereby repeated in full.
				In particular, we would once again highlight the fact that the north-western wall of the proposed Unit A is set right up against our fence (making it difficult, if not impossible, for us to make any repairs or repaint it) and hence materially blocking air flow and light into our house, materially affecting satellite reception of our Sky dish which would face directly such wall, as well as creating a very narrow and claustrophobic corridor provided entirely by our property.
				In addition, it has also transpired that such wall would extend beyond its land boundary and encroach onto our land. This is based on reliable old photos that indicate that the actual boundary is up to about a metre to the south-east of the current wooden fence. The development as proposed is therefore potentially illegal and trespassing on our property.
				The developer had approached us regarding their plan, hoping to seek our support before submission in 2019. We expressed our grave concern around the large size of the two houses combined when considering the relatively limited space that could be created by demolishing the garages. We had said that if the development plan was smaller e.g. a single (larger) dwelling instead of two, we would be more inclined to support. However, the developer told us that a single house would not create enough profit for the flat owners to justify the development. He expressed surprise that we would not support it because in his view, it would potentially increase the value of our property. We told him that money was not everything.
				The submitted plan reinforced our concern that, if approved, it would unreasonably, materially and adversely affect the existing enjoyment of our property. For that reason, we strongly object to the proposal. Financial profitability of the developer/owners should not be given precedence over our right to continue to enjoy our property as affected neighbours.