

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0632/P	Patrick Gilmartin and Katherine Woollacott	07/04/2022 09:43:38	COMMNT	<p>We support the application broadly but have two objections:</p> <p>The proposed rear extension to 17 Parliament Hill is unnecessarily and inappropriately high. The existing extension at 19 Parliament Hill is lower and has a slopping perimeter roof. The size and massing of this existing extension lessens it's impact on adjacent residents. The proposed height of the extension to 17 Parliament Hill is shown related to the highest point of the extension to 15a Parliament Hill, but that extension is less than half the width of the garden and is framed to the southwest by a raised terrace (+- 1200 mm high) at 14 Parliament Hill and it has a sloping roof to the northeast towards 17 Parliament Hill. The immediate circumstances of the adjacent raised terrace and the smaller overall size and the careful massing of the the extension at 15a Parliament Hill lessen its impact on adjacent residents and justify its height. The proposed extension at 17 Parliament Hill is almost full width and it does not slope at the sides. The angling of the plan of the extension at 17 reduces the mass but only slightly. The overall size of the extension is much greater and the massing does not mediate its impact on adjacent residents. The height of the extension at 20 Parliament Hill should not be used as a guide due to the rise in the topography locally. The height of the proposed extension at 17 Parliament Hill should be reduced to align with the height of the extension at 19 Parliament Hill.</p> <p>The window to the southwest side of the extension at 17 Parliament Hill should be raised above eye level or it should be replaced with a roof light to prevent unnecessary loss of privacy between the garden at 15a Parliament Hill and the new extension. The window will also cause light pollution. It is important to note that this loss of privacy is not just to the garden occupants of 15a Parliament Hill. Perhaps the more important loss of privacy will be to the occupants of the new kitchen extension at 17 who will be viewed from the garden of 15a. The proposed angled louvres will prevent views from the rear windows of 15a Parliament Hill but not from the garden. This loss of amenity is easily solved by either raising the window or replacing it with a roof light.</p> <p>If the present height of the proposed side window to the extension is to be maintained and the louvres are to be relied upon then a condition should be added to any approval to ensure that they are maintained in perpetuity.</p> <p>Sincerely Patrick Gilmartin and Katherine Woollacott 15a Parliament Hill</p>

---