				_	Printed on: 25/09/2017 09:10:04
Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4551/P	Professor Tom Cannon	5 Downing Court	21/09/2017 13:47:19	OBJEMAI L	I am the owner of a flat in the adjoining property 5 Downing Court, Grenville Street – probably the flat most affected by this proposed development. I confess to being disappointed that despite the Council's decision to reject the earlier application by Calabar Properties their current proposals and their appeal makes no material attempt to address either the serious concerns identified by me and my neighbours or the concerns of the Council. The current proposals notably the addition of a first floor to the rear will lead to a massive loss of light to the rear of my flat as well as substantial loss of light to neighbours on other rear facing apartments on all ground, first and second floors. This loss of light occurs directly from the inappropriate design, size and height of the extensions. The quality of life in all the affected properties would be diminished. In my own case the tiny garden behind my flat – an oasis of green - would struggle to survive. Like my neighbours I do not object to the change of use to residential units but the plan for a 2 storey mews property at the rear will lead to significant loss of light for properties in Downing Court on the ground, first and second floors. A development sympathetic to the local environment with these concerns addressed would seem to be possible especially given the resources available to Calabar. Finally, I note and object to the substantial basement changes which would seem inevitably to affect the stability of the surrounding area and buildings. Many thanks for your consideration of these concerns.
2017/4551/P	C. Bateman - Jones	9 downing court grenville street	21/09/2017 10:35:10	INT	While the building in question needs renovation, and the proposed change of use in that regard, is welcome, and there have been certain amendments to the last proposal, the negative impact of the proposed development on 9, Downing Court remains unchanged. The proposal will result in considerable loss of light to my property. The supporting report states 'none of the remaining rooms will experience any alteration to their light'. This is not the case from my rear window I currently have 180 degree natural light, with a wall being built at an immediate right angle to my window that amount will be reduced by 50%. This will considerably darken the room at the back of my flat rendering it quite dingy. As mentioned I have no issue with the change of use and the proposed work on the existing building, both of which are to be welcome. However there is no need for there to be a one floor extension at the back this negatively impacts my access to light Furthermore it is also not integral to the rest of the work. The rest of the proposed development would not be rendered less viable by its non approval

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Printed on: 25/09/2017 09:10:04 Response:
2017/4551/P	Elizabeth Bridges	Downing Court Freehold Management Co Ltd Registered office: Wilberforce House Station Rd London NW4 4QE Phone 02087328888	20/09/2017 15:02:41	ОВЈ	I am a Director of Downing Court Freehold Management Company Ltd (DCFM Co Ltd), which owns the freehold of the property adjacent to 11-12 Grenville St. Although the Company would, in principle, support the development of the building (which is in disrepair), we cannot support these particular plans. As with the previous application to redevelop the building, we would not object to the change of use to residential units; however, we do object to any increase in the height or footprint of the property. The plan for a 2 storey mews property at the rear will lead to significant loss of light for properties in Downing Court on the ground, first and second floors. We maintain that this proposed building would cause lack of light to whole of the rear of Downing Court properties, particularly the lower level flats adjacent to the proposed development. We also object to the proposal for substantial basement changes for this development which would affect the stability of the adjacent buildings and mews.