

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/2241/P	Keith Cowell	14/07/2022 15:37:09	OBJ	<p>The proposal has too negative aspects that I feel should be considered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. As noted, the property is a HMO and one which already appears to be extensively occupied with 13 rooms each with en-suite accommodation, but in part due to the phrasing on the Application Form, allows the applicant to say there is no increase in self contained accommodation. The applicant is a commercial company that rents out space in the property and the additional floor area proposed, with its own additional en-suite, would appear to allow an increase in the occupation and rental income. The western end of Lymington Road has similar size and style of property, mainly consisting of conversions into self contained apartments, where the occupation levels are considerably lower than either current or proposed use of the application property. The disparity in density is out of keeping with the properties in Lymington Road. In my view the property is already over populated and would urge the rejection of any further increase.2. The addition of the rear dormer is an unnecessary addition to the roof line viewed from surrounding properties and may well impair privacy currently enjoyed in private gardens. The application refers to two new rooflights on the front roof slope, but only indicates one on the drawings. The room proposed has inadequate height for the sides where the initial ceiling height is identified as 1m, likely to make use of the bathroom particularly challenging. <p>If this was a loft conversion to a larger self contained family dwelling, then the proposal would be considerably more acceptable. As an additional commercial space it is not.</p>
