


✓

6/20 Rep
SD RA



From: Tracy Harvey
Sent: 25 November 2013 11:17
To: Planning
Subject: FW: Council Office Extension Ref: N6/2013/1938/MA

From: Patricia Haines **On Behalf Of** Michel Saminaden
Sent: 25 November 2013 11:13
To: Tracy Harvey
Subject: FW: Council Office Extension Ref: N6/2013/1938/MA



From: Ann Jansz [Redacted]
Sent: 22 November 2013 16:15
To: Michel Saminaden
Subject: Council Office Extension Ref: N6/2013/1938/MA

I've seen the revised plans and still object on the following grounds:

- The application has still not met the national submission standards the Council expects of residents and local businesses. Notices on lamp-posts do not constitute consultation.
- The application continues to ignore the Council's own conservation requirements, using the excuse of its location at the back of the building - this still breaches your conservation area policies. The new building on the police station site is attractive and neo-Georgian in style whichever elevation you view; why not this extension?
- It is an ugly addition and I support the comments of the 20th Century Society in their objection. It looks rather like the cage used to take a cat to the vet.
- This remains a poor design and as the WGC Society asks, should be withdrawn, rethought in its entirety and be subject to full disclosure and proper public consultation before resubmission.
-
- With best regards,
-
- Ann Jansz
- 16 Pitsfield
- AL8 7SJ