

Comment on a planning application

Application Details

Application: 24/1388/FUL

Address: 37 St Margarets Grove Twickenham TW1 1JF

Proposal: Construction of single storey rear extension at ground floor level including removal of existing two-storey rear addition to facilitate works. Associated works including creation of new window opening to the rear outrigger at first floor level.

Comments Made By

Name: Mr. Jonathan De Mello

Address: 39 St Margarets Grove Twickenham TW1 1JF

Comments

Type of comment: Object to the proposal

Comment: 1 of 2

I wish to object to this planning application in the strongest possible terms.

Essentially, the extension based on the plans that have been submitted by No 37 comes some way into my land, as the current garden fence between No 37 and No 39 is not in the right place – and I have only allowed it to sit in its current position to accommodate a very large tree that sits within No 37, and on the boundary line between our properties, though with a clear intention to move the fence back to the boundary line in time. The extension No 37 is proposing is right up to the current fence and therefore well on to my land, and as such has prompted me to ensure that the fence is first put into its correct position, and that the extension No 37 is proposing is wholly built on land actually owned by No 37, and not on my land. Prior to any works being consented by the Council, this boundary issue needs to be resolved and the fence put in the correct place astride the boundary/party wall.

Covering off the specific documents No 37 have submitted as part of the planning application:

Submitted Drawings:

Block Plan: This is wrong and not in line with the Land Registry plan for No 39. For some reason it implies that No. 37 somehow has ownership of land that clearly belongs within the demise of No. 39. The Existing Rear Elevation plan (SV05) by No 37's architect clearly shows the dividing line between the properties, yet the proposed rear elevation (PL05) shows that the extension planned would come well over the boundary line. The proposed ground floor plan (PL01A) further highlights the fact that the extension will come well over the boundary of No 37, into my land.

Design and Access Statement:

3.0: The statement made here is patently incorrect - 'It will also not prove detrimental to the amenities of occupiers in nearby properties by means of excessive overshadowing or loss of privacy.' - there will be significant overshadowing and loss of privacy as a result of the proposed extension. Our kitchen front and velux windows would be completely overshadowed given the height and scale of the proposed extension. We have a 'Right to Light' in our own property and this would essentially be taken away from us given the height and dimensions of the extension.

4.0: The scale of the extension at 3m is grossly out of proportion with other ground floor rear extensions in neighbouring properties – including No 37's immediate neighbours in us and No 35. Extending that far out at the height of the existing extension will create significant overlooking into our garden and kitchen, and loss of light. The examples highlighted (No.7, 69, 71 & 73) are not comparable properties and are far from No. 37.

CIL form:

They have answered both yes and no to question 2) b, and also 3) b – which is clearly not right. 7) - the plans as highlighted will clearly impact the party wall where our respective existing kitchen extensions sit, so surely this needs to be filled in by the applicant. There is no allowance for the party wall in the Submitted Drawings.

Planning Application document:

On the point re: 'Trees or hedges on land adjacent to the proposed development site that could influence the development or might be important as part of the local landscape character?' If Yes to either or both of the above, you may need to provide a full tree survey, at the discretion of the local planning authority. If a tree survey is required, this and the accompanying plan should be submitted alongside the application. – there are indeed trees on both my side and No. 37's, so a full tree survey should definitely be provided.

To address Richmond Council's specific 'material planning considerations' as stated in the Neighbour Consultation document:

- Loss of light or overshadowing: As stated above, there will be significant loss of light and overshadowing of our front kitchen and velux windows, given the dimensions of the proposed extension.

Continued on next form..