

Observations/Comments on Planning Request ST/0749/13/FUL.

This is my reply as the owner and occupier of 70 Greens Place to Mr G Atkinson's letter dated 06-Aug-2013.

The existing plan in the proposals is the old building (ST074913FUL Existing Plans 250713.pdf) which makes it difficult to make any comment upon the proposal. The amended plans approved by the planning committee meeting of the 12-Nov-2012 should now be the existing plans. These are the ones shown on the Decision Notice of 15-Nov-2012, labelled 00 and 000, dated 16-Oct-2012.

The main objection is that the wall, the SW elevation of 71 projecting beyond the extension or off-shot of 70, has not been built according to plans put forward to the committee and is even bigger than the one originally objected to. Details of the variation are listed.

1. The parapets on both the garage top and rear of first floor extension top are built higher than planned. These are four brick courses (.30m) on the garage and seven courses (.5m) on the rear of the house.
2. The side wall of the first floor extension wall top has been raised by a further 7 courses (.5m) from the already increased parapet there. This means that where the side wall joins the rear of No 70 it is about 1m higher than originally planned.
3. The 1.2m high close bonded timber fence, 4m long, has been replaced by a brick wall which is about 6m long with overhanging capping stones. This 4m fence built about 2m longer than planned. This part of the wall is strangely the only part of it built to the planned height.

The additional height of the parapet on the first floor extension makes the roof space into a roof terrace and in fact calling up to the builder from our yard became the easiest way to contact him about the work in progress once the wall had gone up. I and my partner had hoped that when the builder had left, the terrace would no longer be used except for maintenance. This is unfortunately not true.

In view of the objections that were previously raised with the planning office concerning the overshadowing and dominant nature of this wall and now with the additional roof terrace that directly overlooks all the immediate neighbours' yards, I feel that it is not unreasonable to ask that plans that allow it to be extended it has, as detailed above, be turned down.

Along with this and perhaps more importantly from a planning point of view, the detail of the capping off of this wall where it runs alongside the extension of No. 70 has not been addressed in these retrospective plans. There is an agreement under the Party Wall Act that this wall is capped and the architect has provided plans to show how this is to be done. This detail, copy attached, should be included in the plans as this will have to be done before the works at 71 can be signed off.

I have no comment about the solar panels as the plan is rather vague about them but I hope they do not add to the overshadowing of No. 70.

regards Michael Dawson.