



We are writing to object to this application in the strongest possible terms.

The ground floor flat has already been extended at the rear of the house way beyond any other flat in this row of houses, such that its rear extension is already about double the size of the house's original rear extension/those of the other houses in this row.

And none of the other properties in this row has been extended at the rear so that the building extends across the whole width of the property. All of the rear extensions in this row remain part-width extensions only, as originally built.

In this regard, we would challenge the claim made in the "Design and Access Statement" that "*The rear extension does not cause a terrace effect by in-filling the spaces between detached or semi-detached buildings*". Building right across the full width of the property/garden at the rear, right up to next door's boundary, would fill in the space that currently exists to the side of the house - and should next door (91 Savernake Road) follow suit if you allow this application and set a precedent, then there would be very substantial, continuous building across the back of three houses in a row, with the possibility that the rest of the properties in this row would seek to do the same.

We also disagree with the claims that the extension sought: "*has been kept small in scale as to ensure it remains subservient to the existing house*" and "*The proposal aims to respect the form and proportions of the original house and would not be as big or prominent as to dominate its appearance*" and "*is not so large that it dominates and competes with the original building*". Similarly, we dispute the conclusion that "*Overall visual impact of the proposal on the character of the house would be minimal. Consequently, this subtle appearance does not in any way have any negative impact on the overall character and appearance of the neighbouring amenities*".

On the contrary, the proposed extension is completely disproportionate in size to the original house, especially given that the ground floor flat's rear extension is already substantially bigger than any others in this row of houses. Indeed, the new combined footprint of the ground floor rear extension, if allowed, would be even bigger than that of the main body of house, which is nothing like how they were originally built, and plainly dominant. Furthermore, you simply would not expect a house of this one's original size (which has only a small concrete front yard) to have such a small amount of garden at the rear as would remain if permission for this extension were granted.

What is proposed is ugly, inappropriate and unnecessary; and would amount to total over-development of that flat/the house. Allowing it would also set an awful precedent. All in a conservation area.

We would also refer you to your own comments on the previous application (2006/1319/P) to build the conservatory which Miss Rankin is now seeking to demolition before she replaces it with a much more substantial brick extension. In May 2006, you noted that the proposed conservatory "*would be lightweight in appearance, subordinate to the main building and would replace an existing dilapidated structure and is therefore considered acceptable*". None of this is true this time - the existing conservatory is not dilapidated, it would be replaced with a solid brick extension with a solid roof and, when combined with the large brick side-infill extension sought, would totally change and dominate the rear of the building.

If granted, this application would result in a massive loss of amenity/outlook for us, as we live in the 2nd and 3rd Floor Flat of 89 Savernake Road, i.e. above the ground floor flat, and we look down onto its rear and garden from both our kitchen window and our lengthy terrace.

From our kitchen window, we would not see the so-called "courtyard". So all we would see, if this application were permitted, would be the roof of the extension - extending from immediately below us, right to beyond the end of our terrace - and very little garden/unbuilt-on space beyond.

To us, this would be a massive extension, which would remove about half of the garden onto which we currently look. And by building all the way across the width of the property/garden right up to next door's fence, we would completely lose the current feeling of being semi-detached (as the house was originally built) and of there being space between this house and next door. Our view would become predominantly roof. Bearing in mind the whole house already built in the garden of our next door neighbour on the other side (57 Shirlock Road was originally the garden of 87 Savernake Road), the combined effect of these developments to the view from our kitchen window and terrace would be an enormous loss of the gardens/space onto which our flat originally looked. It would represent a massive amount of "in-building" to what was originally built, totally out of keeping with this conservation area.

We would also like to point out that the bedroom, bathroom and terrace of the lady who owns and lives in the First Floor Flat (who is in her sixties) are all directly above the proposed new lobby, WC and living room of the ground floor flat and this application proposes knocking down virtually all of the walls facing the garden below those rooms/terrace. Likewise, our terrace is above what is currently the kitchen of the ground floor flat, so removing those walls from underneath us would inevitably cause us significant nuisance/disturbance whilst the work is carried out, from the vibration, dust and noise etc. It could also damage our properties. Indeed, we have serious concerns about the removal of so many external/supporting walls.

We are also concerned about the possible impact of this application on drainage: what would be the effect of building over so much of the remaining garden if there was a lot of rain/flash-flooding etc? (This issue would obviously be magnified if other properties nearby follow suit if you allow this application.)

In terms of the accuracy of the plans that have been submitted, we would like to note that it is incorrect to say there is currently a bedroom at the front of the ground floor flat, as the plans repeatedly show. This room is, in fact, currently the lounge. Likewise, despite what the plans show, the room between the kitchen and the conservatory is currently a bedroom.

Finally, the plans state that the "courtyard" will be two metres wide but we query whether this is accurate given that the "Proposed Elevations and Section" document shows that its end will align with the window of the floor above, which is less than two metres from the main body of the house. In any event, we do not think this would be wide enough to allow for the erection of scaffolding, and proper access to that scaffolding by workmen, which we need in order to be able to access all of the back of the house, the upper floor windows, the chimneys and the roof to maintain and repair them. We are legally entitled to such access and the ground floor flat owner is legally obliged to provide this to us/the freehold owner of the house.

For all of the above reasons, we object strongly to this application.

If you do allow this application, despite our objections, could you at the very least limit the hours of work at the property to 9:30am - 5:30pm from Monday to Friday only, with no weekend work or work over any Bank holidays. And please could you stipulate that all access to the ground floor flat by anyone connected with the proposed works must be made via Miss Rankin's side gate at the front of the property only and not through the main front door of the house. This is for reasons of security, noise prevention (because

otherwise the front door will be slammed shut repeatedly throughout the day) and in order to keep the hallway and stairs accessible at all times and clean and tidy.

Deborah Williams and Adrian Tempany

2nd and 3rd Floor Flat, 89 Savernake Road, NW3 2LG