

Dear Mr Miller,

I am writing to oppose the planning application for the construction of a new floor (4X1 Bedroom, 1X 3 Bedroom) in Grove Court (6 Lissenden Gardens). **Application 2013/4868/P**

Previously this was to create five self-contained flats. (**Application Reference:2010/2564P Elizabeth Beaumont**) Are these now_10 flats? Or 5 flats converted from the existing units with 5 further to be monetised at a later date?

My opposition is based on the following:

1. Lissenden Gardens is in a conservation area
2. Self-contained flats would increase the population density
3. Further pressure would be put on local services
4. Sightlines for the buildings on the south west corner of Glenhurst Avenue would be badly affected
5. The increase in the height of Grove Court would harm the aesthetic value of the Edwardian houses to the north of it.
6. The felling of enclosure and lack of light for buildings 23 and 21 Glenhurst Avenue is unacceptable.
7. If the change of use from business to residential is allowed the further flats above will be added.

I therefore ask you, please, to reject this planning application.

The fact that plans have resurface yet again is almost a malicious antagonistic pressure upon our time, as we had to fight a previous three schemes on this property this matter is becoming most tiresome. The plan for the roof extension was withdrawn. I believe the council turned down their last plan to demolish the building and to construct a block of eight flats (are the previous 5, with revised business usage still included in this latest plan?).

I presume at this point the new owners were no longer concerned at the loss of jobs along with the loss of warehousing and Industrial space? If so the density of population argument surely still applies?

In Previous applications the council quite rightly pointed to the current overdevelopment of the area (density of population) upholding neighbours objections regarding the loss of daylight on our adjoining properties. I would assume that as office space is harder to rent a simple solution to maintain profits is to sell flats? I do still hope that all the original objections from the council will now be noted and stand?

These flats (based on those still to let in the newly converted church in the same area) will no doubt fetch around £400,000 each which hardly constitutes affordable housing,!

These plans I believe have a **massive impact** upon the houses at the end of Glenhurst Avenue. We originally understood the council's decision to place offices in a residential area based upon the fact it provided jobs. The objection to the extension of business usage was to our loss of light, the enclosure created and the general nuisance of people staring into our houses and bedroom windows!

The previous design statement did not mention my property No 21, only Doctor Allen's property at No 23 (I am sure she will be pleased with people looking into her glass sunroof on the conservatory!). I would like to request that the council official dealing with this application Elizabeth Beaumont visit our property to confirm the loss of privacy and loss of light created.

The impact for sun and light for me is secondary to the feeling of enclosure created by the proposed new buildings. We had added a loft extension in order to have some view of skyline and greenery at the rear of our building. The fact that people would also be staring into our bedroom window is hardly appealing. As the building is contained within a heavily populated conservation area I would argue this application be rejected outright.

Should the council approve the plan, then the building with a new floor added will surely never be a candidate for improvement within the conservation area? I would also question areas of noise disruption and light pollution created by the new hours within which the building would be used.

The original Design and Access Statement declared that there would be approx. 15 metres between the new extension and the back of the Glenhurst Avenue houses. Firstly, I think this could be questioned, on both grounds of light or privacy.

I understand the council would not issue further parking spaces for these flats, Do the current plans have an adequate area for cycle storage?

As I am certain the various hazards, noise disruption and light pollution along with the loss of privacy will lead to a material devaluation in our property prices, we would wish to reserve our rights to have an independent Estate agent and Architect to assess what they believe that damage would be.

I can only hope that the Council rejects these plans on the basis of the various objections listed above.

I have included the Residents association Chairman Stephen Greenstead on my mail as we will no doubt have to fight this nonsense once again. Having won a case to build five further flats above the office space after a series of both regular and long protected debates by the owner of the buildings unless I am misunderstanding the change of use on the offices this seems a rather cynical way to just build further (not affordable) property in a key location.

Shame on them,

Garry

This e-mail, its contents and any attachments are confidential to the intended recipient. It may contain privileged and confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient please do not use or publish its contents. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify us and delete it. Mastertronic Group Limited (company number 4747194), is a company registered in England and Wales whose registered office is 2 Stonehill, Stukeley Meadows, Huntingdon PE29 6ED.