					Printed on:	13/10/2023	09:10:43
Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:			
2023/3547/P	Mark Goodman	12/10/2023 14:11:32	OBJ	Contrary to the inadequate design and access statement: this is NOT just a resubmission of previous applications this proposal to have a much higher mansard roof level dominating the existing ones neighbouring ones which are all of the same height (this can clearly be seen walking it also envisages increasing the height of a chimney breast and also the rear parapet profie of the building (for which no reason is given at all) it does adversely effect the building which is classical in design and based on fundar it does cause greater intrusion to neighbours through increased height of proposed vit does therefore negatively impact both a positive contributor within the conservation conservation area itself Additionally, the front photo on the DAAS is misleading and does not represent the part of this kind which seeks to modify a gray wholly inappropriate way by seeking to represent it as a re-submission when it contains.	down Well Well was and therefore mental symmer windows an area and the proposal proper granted permis	alk) the historic try rly sion in a	