

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/4042/P	Susanne Griffin	24/11/2022 11:07:55	COMMNT	<p>Regarding the Planning and Access Statement 22nd September stating, "To the rear the only change will be the rear upper extension. (See drawings). It is not believed that there will be any significant adverse impact on the neighbours in terms of view, sunlight, shading or privacy.'</p> <p>Please note that my understanding is that the 'existing' building outlined in the submitted plans has not yet been built, but planning application was given recently. My objection is that this new extension application is proposed as an 'add-on' to the planning permission granted in the summer of 2022. For clarity and transparency I would like the two applications to be collated and put forward together as a whole, to be judged together as one joint application which is proposed to replace the building that actually exists in reality on the site today.</p>
2022/4042/P	NEll jordan	24/11/2022 11:01:32	COMMNT	<p>I object to this application. I live in the adjoining property in Marquis Road . We have trouble with continual parties at this property already. Why would you grant permission for a rear terrace on 2nd level. All our privacy will be impacted. And they will continue to have loud parties etc You will then set a precedent for other properties to construct terraces also. I have lodged an objection before but never even get the courtesy of a reply from you</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/4042/P	Ros Franey	24/11/2022 13:08:21	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to this application. First, I don't understand how the applicants can claim that their amended plans don't add anything to their previous submission that could possibly affect neighbours: as far as I can see, the proposal is to turn a present roof terrace on an earlier extension into yet another room, with walls and a ceiling which will inevitably block more light and impinge more invasively on surrounding properties.</p> <p>The house has already been expanded well beyond its original footprint and at a scale incompatible with any claim that it will be architecturally improved by the present proposal. Nor, frankly, can I go along with the assertion that it's a single family house, when neighbours' evidence states that there are multiple occupants who already make a great deal of noise and disturbance. This is surely a house in multiple occupation and the new proposal can only be to cram in more tenants.</p> <p>I live in Marquis Road and am seriously concerned by many recent applications to enlarge the properties in York Way over the entire extent of their land, in some cases up to our garden walls. The houses in our two streets are already very close together and the space between them simply can't take an ever-expanding population. It is environmentally unsound as well as being detrimental to other residents' right to a degree of peace and quiet in their homes and gardens. The proposal at 67 York Way is a prime example: the extra extension upwards will block natural light while generating artificial light pollution at night. It will increase the noise we all have to suffer. And at a time when flood risk is said to be growing, the lack of natural drainage, because every metre of land has been built over, represents a threat to us all.</p> <p>I understand there is nothing that prevents the council from granting planning permission one property at a time - which is what's happening here. But at which point does the cumulative effect of all these planning applications, granted piecemeal, tip the entire area over into something that is not an acceptable living environment?</p> <p>In the Council's own developments it's quite clear that consideration must be given - and has been - to green spaces in between the properties. Why on earth not in Marquis Road and York Way? Our neighbourhood is a conservation area, which covers the gardens of both streets. If the building of sprawling extensions, outwards and upwards, can't be reined in here, then where can it be? If the regulations don't cover this anomaly, then they should be amended urgently. On all these grounds - but specifically with regard to the well-being of the immediate neighbours around 67 York Way - I oppose this application.</p>
