Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:	Printed on:	12/09/2022	09:10:10
2022/3039/P	Rhys Evans	09/09/2022 14:54:32		commenting in my capacity as Director of Evannance investment Co Limited, who are the Freeholders of and 35 Colonnade. These are the premises directly behind the rear of 64-65 Guilford Street.			
				Having had a look at the proposals for the redevelopment of the subject properties, it appears that consideration has not been taken into how the proposed works will impact the buildings at Colonnade.			
				From what I can see on the proposed elevation drawings, no regard has been given to blocking of light to the rear of Colonnade. In fact it appears that the proposed build comes right up to the rear wall at Colonnade, where there are currently windows. Also there are several vents coming from 33 and 35 Colonnade as well as downpipes / soil stacks.			
				On these grounds alone, if I am interpreting the proposed drawings correctly, one must of blocking light / windows, compromising existing ventilation and blocking access to the for maintenance and repair.			
				As well as disturbance during any proposed works to residents at Colonnade, in addition would also be an impact on security - as from the look of it, access to the percolonnade would be made easier and there are several skylights here, from which acceded be gained.	arapet wall	/ roof at	
				Our objection is further compounded given that:  1) The applicant has not discussed the proposals with us - or attempted to make contact 2) The plans appear to be inadequate - not showing the full relationship between the probuldings at Colonnade 3) Excavation and building down at rear of Guilford Street will impact our building and p	oposed bu	ild and the	
				I have only just become aware of the proposals in this planning application, and as such comments now, on behalf of the Freeholder, before the deadline for adding comments of		ng my own	
				Now that this initial contact has been made, we would kindly ask for further time to have respond more formally - which can include suggestions / alternatives to the current proposed ind acceptable.			
				Many thanks,			
				Rhys M Evans Evannance			