		.	G		Printed on:	25/07/2022	09:10:12
Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:			
2022/2242/P	Tim Herbert-Smith	23/07/2022 13:15:53	OBJ	This application follows the Council's refusal of application 2021/5268/P to build a second extension at the property. While this proposal is much more modest the comments material appearance of the mews & harm to the character of the conservation area remain relevant in the various planning documents referred to in the comments & officer's report rejection application also remain relevant in considering this proposal. The main argument put forward by the applicant in support of this proposal is that most already have roof terraces with timber balustrades & roof structures. However, the proposal remains a more bulky & taller structure than those found on other houses. At a heigen considered that it will create disproportionate & inappropriate visual bulk. Furthermore, the grey aluminium cladding proposed for the structure is not sympathet traditional mews location.	The main argument put forward by the applicant in support of this proposal is that most of the mews houses already have roof terraces with timber balustrades & roof structures. However, the proposed staircase enclosure is a more bulky & taller structure than those found on other houses. At a height of 2.45m it is considered that it will create disproportionate & inappropriate visual bulk. Furthermore, the grey aluminium cladding proposed for the structure is not sympathetic or suitable for this		