

Newell Gerzie

From: Planning Support
Subject: FW: Planning Application HGY/2016/1663 - 26 Richmond Road, N11

Sent: 03 June 2016 15:24
To: Robinson Wendy
Subject: Planning Application HGY/2016/1663 - 26 Richmond Road, N11

Dear Wendy, thanks you for your email regarding planning application HGY/2016/1663.

I have examined the revised plans and make the following observations.

- 1) The plans are still substantially incorrect. The existing section (AA) elevation does not represent the building at No 26 as it is now. At the rear it shows a sloping roof of what was once an external lavatory; this was built over prior to 2013 to form a two storey extension. The proposed section (AA) elevation shows the new 4 metre extension starting approximately 1 metre short of where it will actually begin; giving a totally false impression of the scale of the proposed structure.
- 2) The proposed rear extension will still extend 1 metre beyond the rear building line of all the existing rear extensions in Richmond Road; this is grossly disproportionate given the dimensions and layout of the entire south facing rear of the road. As well as being very intrusive this could set a precedent for over development of the area as a whole.
- 3) The new plan appears to be the same as the original submission except for a reduction in length of 0.99 metres and a reduction in height of 0.1 metres. The plan does not show the height of the extension in the rear return adjacent to 24 Richmond Road; I have been told informally that this will be 2.5 metres. Is this the case?
- 4) The absence of clear side elevations makes it impossible to judge what the overall height of the extension will be and there is no information on height of the light canopy or on the construction materials to be used.
- 5) The proposed extension will cause a major reduction in the level and duration of daylight currently obtaining in the living room and kitchen of 24 Richmond Road, and in its garden; it is also highly intrusive visually and in terms of privacy.
- 6) The flaws in the new plan and the failure to address earlier concerns do not inspire confidence in the party that prepared it; more detail is required on exact dimensions and construction materials to obtain a definitive view of what is proposed.
- 7) Accordingly, I object to the application.

Regards Richard Davies.