

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2019/2278/P	Carolyn Jane Best	23/09/2019 15:29:23	OBJ	23/9/2019 – Carolyn Jane Best

As the owner of 8 Mazenod Avenue, I am concerned about the planning application 2019/2278/P.

I understand that 6 Mazenod Avenue has already been developed (approximately 3 years ago) and has 9 separate accommodation units. Parking facilities are already stretched on this road, partly because of the large well-attended Catholic Church opposite, and its social centre.

There would be a further burden on refuse storage and disposal, as there is little room even for the present requirement for dustbins.

The proposal would represent a density of accommodation unsuitable for the area and its resources.

A planning application of 2016 proposed a ground floor lightwell at the rear of the main body of the building, completely enclosed by the existing back additions and the rear development. The rear lightwell now proposed to the basement would be within the original enclosure and effectively two storeys deep and might well not afford sufficient reasonable daylight.

If there is already a lightwell at the front of the house, it has been boarded over, presumably to allow access to the dustbins. An open lightwell here would prevent access to dustbins either for residents or refuse collection. There are no lightwells along that row of about 30 houses and such a one would be inconvenient and afford very little light.

It would seem that these houses are not suitable for development of basements, especially at the front.

It appears that the rear of the basement is to be extended further and the whole of the basement is to be deepened. It should be noted that 8 Mazenod Avenue has recently suffered from subsidence and significant cracking of the walls, including the party wall with 6 Mazenod Avenue. There is evidence of some cracking in 6 Mazenod Avenue, recently noted by our party wall surveyors during an inspection. Deepening and extending the basement of 6 Mazenod Avenue might risk further structural instability.

The application mentions existing underpinning of the party wall with 8 Mazenod Avenue. There is no specification or indication of the age or effectiveness of this underpinning. It might not be suitable to sustain the effect of further development of the basement. There are provisions in the application for retaining and underpinning the party wall between 6 and 4 Mazenod Avenue but none for 6 and 8 Mazenod Avenue. This is a concern, particularly in view of the recent subsidence.

In conclusion, this proposal would appear to provide poor quality habitation and could be a risk to neighbouring properties in respect of its structural provisions.

Carolyn Jane Best