



Dear Mr Marfleet,

This is to object to the above application for the following reasons:

1. No Design and Access Statement or photos have been included.
2. The existing extension may or may not be original but it certainly contributes to the architecture of the conservation area, whereas the proposed extension detracts from it considerably.
3. The proposed building is too high:
 - a. The height of the flat roof is barely lower than the existing pitch roof which is a void. Is so much height necessary for a flat roof?
 - b. The plans indicate that the height is greater than the similarly designed, flat roof extension at no. 61 (2013/0673/P). This height is to the detriment of both adjacent properties at nos. 63 and 67 and is for no discernible reason.
4. No measurements have been provided so the previous point cannot be ascertained. Nor, for the same reason, can it be guaranteed that the finished building will comply with the precise planning permissions rather than an interpretation thereof.
5. There is no 45 degree angle drawing to show the impact on the rights to light at no. 63, nor is the effect on sunlight to the neighbouring property at no. 67 taken into account.
6. The height of the existing extension already blocks Summer sunlight from part of the property at no. 67 and the height combined with the length of the proposed extension will now block most of that sunlight from all except the extreme rear of its garden. This Summer sunlight is significant as there is no sunlight at all during the seven months from May to September, due to the orientation of the houses at this end of Lancaster Grove.

We do hope you will take these points into serious consideration and refuse approval of the application.

Yours sincerely,
Sarah Courtin and Chuck Despina