

James Argles

From: Planning Support
Subject: FW: Planning objection, Alford House , N6

Sent: Sunday, June 11, 2023 1:08 PM

Subject: Planning objection, Alford House , N6

Dear Ms Skelli

I live in Flat 2, on the ground floor in the front block and will be closest to the planned development which will completely affect me including with very significant if not total loss of light through my kitchen, living room and as well bedroom windows.

I believe the planning application is deeply flawed as this is over-development and takes away most of the front lawn of our communal area for two badly designed mews houses that are not in keeping with the style of the area (a conservation area). There are many serious points to cover from:

- loss of light,
- over development,
- loss of precious parking spaces resulting in many cars being pushed into the CPZ,
- drainage issues,
- subsidence issues,
- loss of communal amenities
- building on grass,
- fire risk regarding a gas main,
- loss of privacy,
- diminished local environment.

Additionally:

We were not informed as required about the planning application

- a. Leaseholders in Alford House were not officially informed.
- b. Neighbours were also not informed.

The applicants own light figures and calculation states that one of the proposed bedrooms will be too dark under permitted light regulations and tries to side step the issue by suggesting it could be used as a study instead. Too dark a room is too dark a room under the light regulations no matter how to try to pretend otherwise.

The application is faulty as it has untrue or misleading statements design to confuse the planning authority.

- The application has been amended. This added detail highlights previous issues relating to the loss of car parking, loss of open lawn area, loss of the open outlook and daylight to existing flats, the illegal occupation of the recently constructed penthouse flats and the lack of any provision for the storage of refuse.
- The parking plan is inaccurate. The revised plans show a new space to the side of the rear block but this is already used for parking and the plan showing two spaces on the front boundary is too narrow to accommodate two cars with the plan showing what appears to be a golf cart instead.

- The application states that the car park is underused, but the revised application clearing shows the car park full with pavement parking visible on the aerial photograph demonstrating that the car park is well used with an undersupply of parking for existing flats. The revised application states that there will be one less space available.
- The revised application fails to mention the number of new dwellings proposed and the number of bedrooms is shown as unknown.
- The refuse provision shows existing bin stores, but this is inaccurate because these have never been completed in breach of an earlier application for flats on the roof, clearly visible in the photographs in the revised application showing the incomplete building fenced off. The council have failed in their duty to initiate enforcement action and therefore the flats are currently being illegally occupied.
- The application states that there will be no loss of grassed area, but the revised plan shows that this is untrue.
- Yours sincerely W . May
-