Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Printed on: 15/02/2023 09  Response:	9:10:06
2022/4912/P	Akeva K Avery	10/02/2023 13:39:23	ОВЈ	This proposal, if permitted, would have a totally unacceptable impact on its immediate neighbours; blocking light and spoiling the enjoyment of existing balconies. Tying such a large structure into the back wall of the foundationless terrace would threaten the structural integrity of the entire terrace. Also, the application itself is misleading. Contrary to what the application states, it can be seen (from the mews behind), it is unnecessary (bin storage is available at the front of the house), and the open space of the existing balcony would be lost.	
2022/4912/P	B. Bennett	09/02/2023 16:03:11	OBJ	Dear Nathanial Young I am writing to object to this proposal. The application title is highly misleading as it states "Erection of single storey rear extension at 1st floor level (above existing rear outrigger)." The proposed WC/washroom is not mentioned in this title and what appears to be referred to as "existing rear outrigger" is the attractive small traditional balcony in this conservation area building. The proposal is later described as "Rear extension to first and second floor maisonette over existing extension (reinstatement of former extension) to provide refuse storage and new WC". Again this is misleading as the traditional attractive brickwork upper edge of the balcony shows that it is at its original height as it can be seen matching at 156 and 154 Agar Grove and it is an outside area in which bins could easily be stored. Also there is an easily accessible large paved yard area at the front of the building, surely suitable for storing waste bins, not upstairs in a difficult to access enclosed space? The maisonette already has a bathroom presumably with WC. The reason for supposed storage of waste is stated as: "Due to the upper maisonette not having external storage space for refuse, there have been regular instances where tenants have stored refuse on the flat roof prior to waste collections by the Local Authority. This causing an unpleasant sight and unhygenic environment for tenants and neighbours." This seems spurious as living alongside I cannot remember almost any waste on the balcony and as stated above, the balcony is an outside area in which bins could easily be stored.  Again, responses in the application form are misleading or incorrect. It is stated "Existing materials and finishes: Windows are white uPVC" but the French doors leading to the balcony are timber framed. Plastic windows are not suited at all for this Pub century property. The answer to "Will the proposed development result in the loss, gain or change of use of any open space?" is stated as "No", yet this would result in t	