

For the attention of Patrick Marfleet

Dear Mr Marfleet

Planning Application No **2015/5566/P**

Comments

I am the owner of the house and the occupant of the ground and first floor at 30 Lady Somerset Road – the next-door premises to that in the planning application and I wish to point out some features therein that I oppose in varying degrees.

1. The Front Roof slope Dormer window.

No house in the lower part of Lady Somerset Road has a front slope Dormer window and previous applications to do this have been refused in previous years, myself included, only Velux windows have been allowed and are in place in the roof of the house in question already.

2. Back Roof slope Dormer window.

These Dormer windows seem to be getting larger and larger – I have no objection to a Dormer here at the back of the property but this one looks like it covers virtually the whole width of the roof and as such seems excessively large.

3. Back side and rear brick extension.

Although I am not exactly enamoured with the view of a brick wall replacing the wood framed glass of the current conservatory which will be closer to my windows and sight, providing it is not too much higher (at the most 1 metre) than the existing party wall I can just about accept it as I can grow some climbing plant on a trellis or something to make the image better.

However if as the proposed extension plans show, the new structure was to continue past the original 1880's building line of the back of the building and that of the existing conservatory to the rear line of the more recent single storey extension a distance of approx 3 metres - then I am against this extra length.

This extra length of building would reduce some of the daylight and sunlight etc. coming into my kitchen windows and also the visual aspect from my window will be considerably impaired.

I am very forcibly against this particular area of the proposals.

4. Whilst not a problem of planning as such - but connected with the proposed extension above - the applicant when he recently took possession of the premises asked me about possible access to his property across my garden from my street garden door to facilitate some building works he had in mind and I had replied tentatively that I would consider something.

When I looked at the proposed planning application plans on the website I saw that **exactly where the only logical place I had considered allowing access across my garden and through the party garden wall was where the extra length of the extension beyond the 1880's building line had been placed.**

There is no other position that I would accept.

5. Noise and disruption.

There is no doubt going to be considerable noise and disruption caused by these proposals I trust that working will be only on weekdays and that the hours will be sensible.

Also as the rear brick extension against the party garden wall will probably necessitate working from my premises at some point so any damage to a mature garden and plants must be avoided as much as possible.

David Anthony Cook

26 October 2015

For the attention of Patrick Marfleet

Dear Mr Marfleet

Planning Application No **2015/5566/P**

Comments

I am the owner of the house and the occupant of the ground and first floor at 30 Lady Somerset Road – the next-door premises to that in the planning application and I wish to point out some features therein that I oppose in varying degrees.

1. The Front Roof slope Dormer window.

No house in the lower part of Lady Somerset Road has a front slope Dormer window and previous applications to do this have been refused in previous years, myself included, only Velux windows have been allowed and are in place in the roof of the house in question already.

2. Back Roof slope Dormer window.

These Dormer windows seem to be getting larger and larger – I have no objection to a Dormer here at the back of the property but this one looks like it covers virtually the whole width of the roof and as such seems excessively large.

3. Back side and rear brick extension.

Although I am not exactly enamoured with the view of a brick wall replacing the wood framed glass of the current conservatory which will be closer to my windows and sight, providing it is not too much higher (at the most 1 metre) than the existing party wall I can just about accept it as I can grow some climbing plant on a trellis or something to make the image better.

However if as the proposed extension plans show, the new structure was to continue past the original 1880's building line of the back of the building and that of the existing conservatory to the rear line of the more recent single storey extension a distance of approx 3 metres - then I am against this extra length.

This extra length of building would reduce some of the daylight and sunlight etc. coming into my kitchen windows and also the visual aspect from my window will be considerably impaired.

I am very forcibly against this particular area of the proposals.

4. Whilst not a problem of planning as such - but connected with the proposed extension above - the applicant when he recently took possession of the premises asked me about possible access to his property across my garden from my street garden door to facilitate some building works he had in mind and I had replied tentatively that I would consider something.

When I looked at the proposed planning application plans on the website I saw that **exactly where the only logical place I had considered allowing access across my garden and through the party garden wall was where the extra length of the extension beyond the 1880's building line had been placed.**

There is no other position that I would accept.

5. Noise and disruption.

There is no doubt going to be considerable noise and disruption caused by these proposals I trust that working will be only on weekdays and that the hours will be sensible.

Also as the rear brick extension against the party garden wall will probably necessitate working from my premises at some point so any damage to a mature garden and plants must be avoided as much as possible.

David Anthony Cook

26 October 2015