Application No.	Consultoes Names	Consultoes Addu	Danisada	Comment	Printed on: 29/06/2015 09:05:18
<b>Application No:</b> 2015/2534/P	Beverley Bonner 43A Lancaster 25/06/2015 21:52:11 OBJ I live next door to 45 Lancaster Grove and have suffered for the past 4 years to monstrosity that was built without planning permission, and remains despite to		I live next door to 45 Lancaster Grove and have suffered for the past 4 years from this visual monstrosity that was built without planning permission, and remains despite the enforcement order		
		Belsize Park London NW3 4HB			having been served.  Their proposal to replace this with yet another awful scheme is a nightmare from hell.
					It is nearly as high as the retrospective application that was refused permission, so there can be no argument that it is too high. The scheme that received permission in 2005/8 was 2.6 metres high. The roof was level with the transom of the Bay window so we knew exactly where the roof should be. The proposal is 3.2 metres high, and will look awful, destroying the rear elevation of this beautiful Victorian Building.
					It is 6 metres wide. The illegal extension is 9 metres wide so they are still trying to get a building they is 70% of the size. It is still enormous.
					The West side of the extension crashes into the side of the Bay window which is the most important feature on this rear wall. There should be a metre space between the side wall and the Bay to allow it to breathe.
					Please, please refuse this application and lets get something that respects 45 Lancaster Grove.
					Beverley Bonner

A	C	Company Adding	D	C	Printed o	: 29/06/2015	09:05:18	
Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:			
2015/2534/P	Sarah Howard		29/06/2015 00:39:16	OBJ	Dear Sir or Madam,			
					I am writing to object to the proposals for 45 Lancaster Road.			
					I live in the Belsize Conservation area and care very deeply for this area and its residents.			
					An examination of the submitted plans makes it clear that the proposed extension at 45 Lancaster Grove is too wide. It is much wider than other extensions in the street and it would clearly damage the bay window at the rear of this property at the heart of the conservation area.			
					The proposed extension is also far too long because it would now be 3.3 metres high. This would mean much valuable light would be lost from the neighbouring property 47 Lancaster Grove			
					I know that there is already a substantial and difficult planning history as regards this proposed extension. These new plans suggest that nothing has been learnt. The height of the demolished extension was 2.4m. The height of the approved 2005/2008 schemes was 2.6m. The new proposal suggests a height of 3.2m height. This would cause a severe reduction in the? sunlight (and daylight) from the West, causing massive shadowing that did not exist previously.			
					This proposed extension is as high as the extension that was refused permission in mm lower than the current built extension. This will be very damaging to those roverlook the extension.	•		
					As part of this objection, I would make it clear that I very much support the commanded FRICS in objection to these proposals.	ents made by Barri	e	
					Thank you in advance for taking account of my objection to the wholly misconce proposed for no. 45 Lancaster Grove.	ved extension		
					Your sincerely,			
					Sarah Howard (I would be grateful if you could redact my address and contact details on your w	bsite.)		