

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/6035/P	Felix Moldenhauer	28/02/2022 00:07:12	OBJ	<p>I object to this planning application (no. 2021/6035/P) for a "Ground Floor Side &amp; Rear wrap around Extension" at 57 Hillfield Road in its current form.</p> <p>As owner of the neighbouring lower ground floor flat at 55A Hillfield Road, I am severely impacted by the proposed extension due to its size, height, and unusual design - all of which are unmatched in the whole terrace.</p> <p>The consequence of such development would be a substantial loss of amenity (including loss of light, etc.) for my lower ground floor flat and create a sense of enclosure, in particular affecting my bedroom and the lightwell: a full-height, panel-glazed door provides light from the lightwell to the bedroom.</p> <p>In addition, the plans accompanying the application feature significant errors, which misrepresent the local conditions and do not allow to fully appreciate the proposal's implications on my property.</p> <p>A) Errors in submitted plans</p> <p>A.1) The plan of the existing rear elevation [RHS on page 2 of 'Existing plans, elevations and photos - PA - Rev B'] misrepresents the location of the door to the lower ground floor flat in the lightwell on my side of the boundary: the top edge of this full height, panel-glazed door is not aligned with the smaller windows at #57 (see site photograph #3 in application), but is 50 cm lower and sits in a 2.4m deep lightwell.</p> <p>B) Size, height, and design</p> <p>B.1) The proposed wrap-around extension will create a 10m long wall on the boundary line, facing my property and enclosing my lightwell. [This is 2m longer than in a previous planning application.]</p> <p>B.2) The minimum height of this wall - before turning into a sloped roof - is 2.40m. [This is 40cm heigher than in a previous planning application.]</p> <p>B.3) This wall rises up to 3.9m in height over the 3m closest to the main building. [In the previous application, the rise only starts just below the mid point of the first/second floor windows on the rear wing. The new design extends this super heigh section of the wall by over 50%.] Taking into account the depth of the lightwell, the resuling wall on the boundary line would be more than 6m in height.</p> <p>On the grounds of the above, I ask for the planning application in its current form to be refused.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/6035/P	Felix Moldenhauer	27/02/2022 23:57:55	OBJ	<p>I object to this planning application (no. 2021/6035/P) for a "Ground Floor Side &amp; Rear wrap around Extension" at 57 Hillfield Road in its current form.</p> <p>As owners and occupiers of the neighbouring ground floor flat at 55 Hillfield Road, my family and I are severely impacted by the proposed extension due to its size, height, and unusual design - all of which are unmatched in the whole terrace.</p> <p>The consequence of such development would be a substantial loss of amenity (including loss of light, view, etc.) for my ground floor flat and create a sense of enclosure, in particular affecting: my side garden, the kitchen in the rear wing with windows and door facing #57, and the back parlour (used as office) with windows/door facing the garden.</p> <p>In addition, the plans accompanying the application feature significant errors, which misrepresent the local conditions and do not allow to fully appreciate the proposal's implications on my property.</p> <p>A) Errors in submitted plans</p> <p>A.1) The plan of the existing rear elevation [RHS on page 2 of 'Existing plans, elevations and photos - PA - Rev B'] misrepresents the location of the door to the lower ground floor flat in the lightwell on my side of the boundary: the top edge of this full height, panel-glazed door is not aligned with the smaller windows at #57 (see site photograph #3 in application), but is 50 cm lower and sits in a 2.4m deep lightwell.</p> <p>A.2) On the proposed ground floor plan [LHS on page 1 of 'Proposed plans and elevations - PA - Rev B(2)'], it is stated that the proposed wrap-around extension "align[s] with No 55". Yet on my side of the boundary, there is my side garden, and not an extension that the proposal would align with.</p> <p>B) Size, height, and design</p> <p>B.1) The proposed wrap-around extension will create a 10m long wall on the boundary line, facing my property and enclosing my side garden and kitchen.</p> <p>B.2) The minimum height of this wall - before turning into a sloped roof - is 2.40m. [This is 40cm heigher than in a previous planning application.]</p> <p>B.3) This wall rises up to 3.9m in height over the 3m closest to the main building. [In the previous application, the rise only starts just below the mid point of the first/second floor windows on the rear wing. The new design extends this super heigh section of the wall by over 50%.]</p> <p>On the grounds of the above, I ask for the planning application in its current form to be refused.</p>