

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/1996/P	Altynay Davletova	14/07/2023 16:59:04	OBJ	While we support property renovation in general, we object to certain aspects of the proposed extension, specifically the length of the proposed extension and its height at the boundary with our property, which would make the proposed extension disproportionately large and unprecedented in size compared to all properties on Agamemnon Road and will make negative impact on available light to our property. Please refer to the document we sent via email for more detail.
2023/1996/P	Jonathan Miller	14/07/2023 18:12:01	OBJ	<p>Comment Type Objection to certain aspects of the proposal</p> <p>While we support property renovation in general, we object to certain aspects of the proposed extension, specifically the length of the proposed extension and the height of the proposed extension at the boundary with our property.</p> <p>Proposed extension length</p> <p>The proposed extension length appears to be 4200mm. While the Design and Access statements lists similar approved applications, we note that in all but 2 cases the extension length did not exceed 3200mm from the original building. See table below.</p> <p>2022/3070/P 2019/5556/P 2019/1241/P 2016/6669/P 2015/6355/P 2015/6355/P 2014/7175/P 8702891 2022/2820/P 2022/0300/P</p> <p>The only two approved extensions exceeding 3200mm are 38 Agamemnon Rd (extension length is 3500mm) and 39 Achilles Rd (extension length 4200mm). 38 Agamemnon Rd already had a 3500mm long extension built in the 80s and the application was merely an approval of the side extension, so this case is not relevant.</p> <p>In case of 39 Achilles Rd, the 4200mm length was likely achieved because 37 Achilles Rd already had 4200mm extension while 41 Achilles Rd was extending to the same length (application Number 2020/1869/P). Note that 41 Achilles Rd did not get 4200mm extension approved on the side of 43 Achilles Rd and had to curtail the length to just 2700mm, to be in line with 43 Achilles Rd.</p> <p>Therefore, the proposed extension of 4200mm would be by far the biggest in the surrounding area. Moreover, it would protrude beyond our building by 1800mm. This is also unprecedented as we note that None of the approved applications above had extensions protruding beyond their neighbouring buildings at all.</p> <p>Proposed extension height</p> <p>The proposed extension is 3200mm in height which I believe is higher than necessary and higher than neighboring property</p>