

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2253/P	Neville Surti	09/07/2021 13:54:42	AMEND	<p>ADDENDUM TO DESIGN STATEMENT 2002-DS01 FOR 56 HILLWAY, HOLLY LODGE ESTATE, LONDON N6 6EP. PLANNING APPLICATION REFERENCE 2021/2253/P</p> <p>The Owner/Applicant of 56 Hillway has noted concerns expressed about overlooking and privacy with regards to the above application.</p> <p>He has therefore undertaken an open dialogue with the Owner/Occupier of 54 Hillway, who would be most affected by the proposal. Out of this discussion there are two suggestions that they request be considered as part of the application and were felt to respond sensitively to this issue.</p> <p>Firstly, the frameless glass balustrade to the south elevation (as indicated on drawing 2002 PL012 Proposed South Elevation) only be changed from clear to frosted glass. Both parties agree that this will provide greater privacy to No 54 while being in a position that will not affect all round views from anyone else in the neighbourhood.</p> <p>Secondly, as part of this discussion the Applicant also has agreed that if as part of any permission, a condition be inserted that limits the use of the terrace specifically to health and wellness purposes, this would be acceptable to him. It has always been the Applicant's case that this application is only relevant to this particular property due to its unique position where its garden is severely over shadowed by a large mansion block. It is not intended that this set a planning precedent, but provide a bespoke solution to this problem.</p> <p>The Applicant requests that you include both the above points in your consideration of the proposal. Hopefully the latter enables you to grant a planning permission with such conditions as you think fit, tailored to tackle specific problems, rather than standardised or used to impose broad unnecessary controls. The Applicant is happy to discuss this matter if so required.</p> <p>09 July 2021</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2253/P	Philip and Monica Sanders	09/07/2021 10:44:42	OBJ	<p>The terrace extends up to the party wall with our property. We have several seating and eating areas both close to the back of the house and towards the rear of the garden. We disagree with the Design Statement claim that there would only be a slight increase in visibility over neighbours gardens no worse than what can currently be seen from the second floor rear windows of No 54. The view from a large and higher open terrace will be much more extensive over our garden and seating area than is presently the case. This is apparent from the photograph in the objection of HLE CAAC.</p> <p>The roof terrace would cover a large area of over 200 sq ft. We note that No 56 has had two rear extensions beyond the original building line. Firstly, in 1986 on the ground floor out from the back and in 1991 by adding a second storey above. The roof terrace would be a third additional level to the original property. Nos 54 and 58 have only added rear conservatories to the original buildings.</p> <p>If the balustrades were positioned further in from the margins of the roof to create a terrace of a more modest size the scope for overlooking neighbours either side would be much reduced, while retaining ample space for sunbathing, the health benefits of which are said to be the purpose of the project.</p> <p>If the project goes ahead, the use of frosted, not clear, glass on at least the side panel adjacent to our property would substantially limit overview, while having minimal visual impact.</p> <p>When No 56 is occupied it is normally by the owner, sometimes with visiting relatives, or by tenants to whom, as stated in his current objection to development at No 58, he regularly rents out the property when he is living abroad. When the house is used by people we do not know we are concerned about possible noise and disturbance with visitors congregating at any time of day or evening on such a large space.</p> <p>The Design Statement states that "the primary activity envisaged externally (i.e. sunbathing) within the area proposed would not cause unacceptable noise at a high level and the hours of usage would be limited to sunny periods only". If permission is to be granted, we ask that it should be made subject to appropriate conditions restricting noise, hours of use and numbers of users.</p>