Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Printed on: 26/01/2021 09:10:05 Response:
2020/5168/P	Mr David Shakespeare	20/01/2021 11:46:28	OBJ	This planning application is in part a duplication of planning application 2020/5469/P which covers the replacement of the windows. 2020/5469/P has been responded to separately.
				This objection addresses the proposed infill extension. We wish to object on the basis that the infill will reduce the light into our property. The north side of our property will have a reduction in light if the infill extension is approved. The current outside area has no structure other than a low panel fence. The proposed fixed structure is at least twice the current height of the panel fence. We are also concerned that there will be increased light pollution from this infill extension into our north bedrooms which are at the same level.
				In addition, we wish to object to the installation of PV panels as these will be visible from the second floor of our property. Currently there is a consistent flat roof view and this will be impeded by the installation of PV panels.
2020/5168/P	Rosan and Derek Bowry	15/01/2021 17:03:59	OBJ	As we are in the basement flat we will lose light and be overlooked in our windows if the extension goes ahead.
2020/5168/P	Barbara Romito	25/01/2021 20:21:53	OBJ	In addition to my previous comments: I object to any increase of height of the current barriers on the north and west sides resulting in reduced light and privacy; the plans are incomplete eg mode of drainage from the sloping roof?; the clear glazing would produce 'glare' on two sides (south and west) from sunlight; similarly, the placing of solar panels should also take 'glare' in to account and be mindful of 'clutter' on the roof that is overlooked by many; I have concern for my neighbours being inadvertently silent in Warren Street, Conway Street and Fitzroy Square who will not have had the opportunity to read the (only) 2 notices placed in the Mews and outside 25 Warren Street (unaffected by this application), due to lockdown.
2020/5168/P	Bridget MacDonald	24/01/2021 12:21:47	COMMNT	I am aware of the plans and have examined them. Whilst they do not impact directly on me once built they will impact on our neighbours' light and privacy. The impact of extending the living area onto what is now a balcony will also bring noise closer to their windows at a later time of day and evening. Ill feeling in a neighbourhood reduces the quality of life in small communities and the impact of that should be considered. The work in the narrow mews which acts as a "sound box" amplifying and ricocheting noise will affect me during working hours albeit only for the time of building, which I should hope would be kept to a minimum.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Printed on: 26/01/2021 09:10:05 Response:
2020/5168/P	Barbara Romito	18/01/2021 12:48:45	ОВЈ	I am the owner of 18 Conway Street W1T 6BE
				I note that 8 Richardson's Mews is part of the Fitzroy Square Conservation Area
				I STRONGLY OBJECT to the proposed infill of the terrace on the 2nd floor of 8 Richardson's Mews:
				1. The infill will cause REDUCTION OF LIGHT to the back of my property, over 3x floors;
				2. The infill, predominantly made up of glazed windows, will remove PRIVACY through OVERLOOKING to 3x floors (plus 2x mezzanines) comprising:
				Basement: 1x triple, 2x standard and 1x large (sash) windows;
				Ground: 2x double, 1x standard, 1x extra large (sash) windows;
				1st Mezzanine: 3x double, 1x standard windows, plus glass door and garden;
				1st Floor: 1x extra large window (sash);
				2nd Mezzanine: 1x extra large window.
				This proposal affects multiple properties in Warren Street, Conway Street and Richardson's Mews (south side) for the same reasons as above.
2020/5168/P	Martin Armstrong	15/01/2021 17:40:36	OBJ	My objection is for the following reasons namely reduced light and privacy. Also it should be noted that when the property in Richardson Mews was built in the 1980s the plans for the second floor side was objected to by all the residents in Conway Street who were affected. As a result the side wall had to be built further back which is the reason for the open space. I think there would have been a restrictive covenant in place preventing an extension such as is proposed.