

Printed on: 10/01/2022 09:10:04

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3586/P	GARY SOLLOF	09/01/2022 09:58:52	OBJNOT	<p>I am the owner of one of the houses to the rear of this property, on Colville Place and we will be directly affected by this proposal, so I would like to object to it.</p> <p>The main issue for me is one of noise disturbance created by people using the terrace, as the terrace extends fully to the rear of the property, where it is open, so there is nothing there to stop any noise created on this terrace from flowing into the 'well' at the rear of the property.</p> <p>This 'well' is enclosed on 4 sides, formed by the buildings on Whitfield St, Goodge St, Colville Place and Whitfield St. All of the properties on the Colville Place side of this 'well' are residential and nearly all of the properties on Goodge Street side, above ground floor, are also residential. I would say that nearly all of the windows on the rear all of these residential properties are bedrooms.</p> <p>Any noise generated here, however small, reverberates around all of the buildings.</p> <p>There was a case about 11 years ago where an illegal roof terrace on the rear of 37 Goodge St was formed and it was a nightmare, as when it was used, which was regularly, any noise reverberated around the well and disturbed all of the residents. This mainly occurred in the evening and often woke our young children and stopped us sleeping.</p> <p>I can see that the applicants agent has noted that number 31 and 35 Goodge St already have a terrace that runs from the front to the rear of those properties, but I understand those terraces were granted permission in the 1980's and it was a mistake, which should not be repeated again 40 years later.</p> <p>The applicant has also highlighted that many of the properties along the northern side of Colville Place, which back onto the 'well' and includes my property, have extended onto their roofs and formed a room and terrace there. However, as you can see from the aerial photo provided in this planning application, all of these roof extensions, have created a room fully across the rear, with the terrace on the front, so any noise will be directed to the front where there are no other properties, as these houses overlook Crabtree Fields. Having a structure fully across the rear of the building works very well at protecting the other residents that share the enclosed 'well' at the rear, from being disturbed from any noise from those terraces, as the structure blocks the noise from going into the 'well'. Not having a structure fully across the rear, as is proposed here leaves the rear open and all of the residents there to being disturbed by whatever noise is generated on the terrace.</p> <p>Also, I wonder if this proposed extra building height will block any light from going into the well and the windows of the properties on Colville Place?</p>

Printed on: 10/01/2022 09:10:04

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3586/P	Christiane Ten-Hoopen	08/01/2022 12:29:04	OBJ	<p>Dear Elaine Quigley,</p> <p>On behalf of the BCAAC I would like to object to the above application for the following reasons. The design of the proposed extension is in an inappropriate style because it is not in keeping with the host building. It is also close to the front so one would be able to see it from the street. This proposal is without precedent given the lack of roof extensions in this area. As a principle we discourage increased height of buildings in the conservation area.</p> <p>Christiane Ten-Hoopen</p>
