

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/2820/P	Clare Sunderland	03/09/2022 15:30:51	OBJ	<p>I am the neighbour resident at No 36 Agamemnon Road, and have lived here since 1970.</p> <p>This seems a very undesirable development, given that the house has shared occupancy.</p> <p>It is difficult to see how normal life can possibly continue for the residents of the upstairs flat whilst walls and ceilings of the flat below are being removed.</p> <p>Considerable structural alteration has already taken place (early 1980s, by Christopher Van Kampen (architect then living in the flat) and although there does seem to be a case for improving insulation, it seems a pity that what was clearly sturdily built then has now got to be destroyed.</p> <p>I have had a number of cracks in the bedroom adjoining the junction with the current back extension, and am anxious that the existing wall - and roof level, are not interfered with.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/2820/P	Peter Coles	03/09/2022 15:57:27	OBJ	<p>As one of a family of 5 living in the maisonette directly above the applicants (for which we own a joint freehold with the applicants) I would like to register an objection to the proposed development of the ground floor flat. My wife and I have had two amicable meetings with the applicants (and on one occasion including our next neighbour) where we have raised some of our concerns and have received a sympathetic response, but no substantial reassurances. My main concerns are threefold:</p> <p>(1) aesthetic: While the proposed development is not visible from the street, it will severely impact our view over the rear of our long-standing family home (since 1998). The extension is clearly out of character with this late Victorian terraced house, which included a 'return' giving access to the rear garden. The original design did not require more space on the ground floor and was not meant to allow for this via extensions.</p> <p>(2) structural: While appreciating that this stage of the process is one of planning approval, we nevertheless have serious concerns about the potential for irreversible destabilisation of the structural integrity of the entire property. We already experience cracks in the plaster, which are increasingly frequent with hot weather and drying out of the soil. Removing load-bearing walls and tanking out the 'return' could exacerbate the underlying causes of these cracks. We are also very concerned about walls that support a large part of our living space being - albeit temporarily - removed. This could go badly wrong if mishandled with consequences that do not bear thinking about.</p> <p>(3) Disruption. We have witnessed similar developments in houses in the street and know that they invariably take far longer than anticipated - not least because of post-Covid and post-Brexit problems with global supply chains of building materials. This exposes us to the potential, as upstairs residents, of living above a space open to the elements on two sides for months on end, possible during a cold winter. No provision in this development is made to recompense us for the extra heating required (as energy prices soar) of living above a space that is impossible to insulate. Both of the wage-earning adults in our family often work from home. The noise and disruption of comings and goings of construction workers, electricians, plumbers will inevitably make it near impossible to work effectively (one space we use for writing and Zoom calls looks out directly over the return which is to be excavated and built on.)</p> <p>The construction work will involve removing ceilings (our floors) with the inevitable production of large quantities of dust (we've already experienced this when a downstairs ceiling collapsed a few years ago). The need of the builders to have constant access to the ground floor will mean that our shared front door will remain open, posing an obvious security threat. We are a family with three teenagers at home.</p> <p>We very clearly discouraged the previous owner of the downstairs flat against suggesting that there was scope for enlargement, as we knew this would have the above impacts. He failed to do this and as a result we feel that the present owners may have purchased a space that did not realistically have the potential to match their long term needs.</p>