					Printed on:	05/01/2022	09:10:03
Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:			
2021/4965/P	James Dooley	31/12/2021 13:43:41	AMEND	Corrections to Objection/comments submitted by James Dooley (18th December 2021)			
				In section B ¿Other comments¿, the house numbers given in 1b, 1d, 3b and 3c are not correct. Thus, across these particular comments, No 8 should be No 9, and No 9 should be No 10. I apologise for any confusion caused.			
				These ¿Other comments¿ in [B] should read:			
				1b. I have concerns for the occupant of No 9, since their boundary with No 10 will be for 2.5 metres and then a 1.73 high wall to the back of their garden. If I were the residuould substantially affect the openness of my garden. Has the occupant of No 9 agree	dent there, I th	nink that this	
				1d. The garden border with No 9 Regency Lawn I think is also planned as brick wall be Again, in my view if done, wood panel fencing (as now) would look and feel more in k gardens.			
				3b. From the plans, it seems that there is a widening of the ground base of No 10 tow property. Is this within the current coordinates of No 10, since it is not shown on docu Location Plan. This apparent narrowing of the entry road needs clarification and I wou view of Mr Anil Varma, the developer of the Mansfield Bowling Club site.	ıment LM100	2021 1009	
				3c. Presumably a party wall agreement would be needed with the owner of No 9 Reg proposed construction along their boundary with the entry road with Harrison Varma.	•	s well for the	
				James Dooley 31st December 2021			