

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/3357/P	Anthony Rothern	26/10/2022 18:00:31	OBJ	<p>I object strongly to Mr. Norden's plan for enlargement of the garage which opens onto Nassington Road, and belongs to 28, Parliament Hill.</p> <p>I am a resident of Oakford Court, and one of the three freeholders of this property which shares a boundary with the garage/garden in question. We are down the hill, our garden being 2m. below the level of the garden in which Mr. Norden is currently erecting a large garden building which he tells us he has planning permission to build.</p> <p>The garage proposal is worrying as his plan seems to include in his development the pillar which the party wall between us terminates. This pillar does not belong to him, is matched in brick with Oakford Court, and stands to the height which is matched by the pillar on the other corner of our property.</p> <p>It does not belong to Mr. Norden, and I refuse to consent to his use of a part of our building.</p> <p>His drawn plan, I believe, attempts to deceive the viewer. He intends to build up our pillar to the height of the new roof, and attach his new garage door to it.</p> <p>Again, I refuse to allow this to happen.</p>
2022/3357/P	Jeremy Herman	28/10/2022 21:03:36	PETITNOBJ E	<p>As a freeholder of the adjoining property I object in the strongest possible terms to this enlargement. As I understand it expansions are unlawful if they extend to within 2 meters of the property boundary. This application would both raise the height of the garage and extend it all the way to the boundary line. Applicants have claimed in conversation that this is a party wall case, but the plans indicate that they intend not only to raise the boundary wall but to bring the entire side of the building right up to the edge of our property.</p> <p>Their convenience in accommodating an extra-large vehicle (an SUV) in a garage intended for a regular-sized domestic car does not justify a structure inappropriate for its surroundings.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/3357/P	Nigel Knight	27/10/2022 21:20:33	COMMNT	<p>I am the owner of Flat 1 (ground floor flat), Oakford Court, the adjacent property to the end of the garden of the lower ground floor flat, 28 Parliament Hill ('the property') - where the proposed garage extension work is being proposed. I have 3 comments, 2 of which are, I believe, material considerations to this application.</p> <p>My first comment is that, while I am not an expert in the current planning regulations, I am very surprised that the owners of the property have commenced work on this project and are already well advanced BEFORE the results of their planning application are known. If this is illegal, then presumably all work should be halted immediately pending the outcome of this application.</p> <p>Second, and most importantly, we are very concerned about the potential impact of this extension on our boundary walls from a safety perspective. The end of the property is currently some 2 meters or so above our property with the boundary wall comprising a series of suspended concrete beams. This wall, we understand, was established in the 1980's and has not, to date, caused any issues. However, it is clear looking from the street (ie Nassington Road) and from the higher floors of Oakford Court, that the owner's contractors have already excavated a very large and deep hole which extends pretty much across their garden and well beyond the proposed new wall shown in the plan. Our concern is whether this excavation and subsequent proposed extension is a safety risk - in that it could undermine the current boundary wall, and potentially lead to a collapse or land slip in the event of heavy rain. At a minimum we believe that the owner of the property should obtain - and share with us as owners of this party wall - an independent professional engineering assessment of the potential risks involved and how any such risks should be mitigated in the design.</p> <p>Second, while this needs to be confirmed, our understanding from the title deed to Oakford Court is that we are the owners both of the boundary wall and the pillar adjacent to the pavement that marks the end of our property (and is finished in exactly the same brickwork as the rest of Oakford Court). This pillar has, incidentally, already been damaged quite significantly during the ongoing work mentioned above. It appears that the intention of the planned extension of the garage is in effect to incorporate (or even replace?) the pillar into the expanded garage space and to build right up to and 'over' the boundary wall which we have also mentioned above. If we are correct that these are part of the Oakford Court property then surely this extension cannot proceed without our permission/support?</p> <p>Finally, while this is not a formal comment on the application I would like to add that we are sure that a number of the above problems could have been avoided if the owner of the property had had the basic politeness to come and discuss these plans with us in advance so that we could have ironed out any potential issues in advance. Sadly, the first time we learnt of these plans was when a very large hole appeared immediately adjacent to our boundary wall - hence the need for us to respond formally and raise these material considerations for the planning committee to consider.</p>