Dear Mr Marfleet,

As the resident of the first floor flat at 65 Lancaster Grove, I would like to object to the above application for these reasons:

1. The proposed extension detracts from the design and architecture of the conservation area, and is out of keeping with the general style of the area. Further, it removes the pitched roof, which *is* consonant with the style of the conservation area. In addition, the flat roof itself has no architectural merit as regards its particular design and size, but it detracts from the design and architecture of the area in general, the houses in Lancaster Grove, and this house in particular.
2. The tree report suggests that this extension will not damage trees other than ornamental foliage. However, given the failure of the recent extension at Number 61 to stick to the strict guidelines established by their permission, this report offers scant comfort and in turn suggests there is undue risk that the extension will likewise overextend into the garden, and cause damage to the trees currently situated. This would create an unfortunate precedent allowing other houses to remove trees and gardens, again to the detriment of the conservation area.
3. The proposed loss of part of the garden involves the loss of a visual amenity enjoyed by the First Floor flat, an overdevelopment of the site, and in particular undue ‘garden grabbing’.
4. The Design and Access Statement states that access into and within the dwelling will not be affected by the proposals. However, the proposed extension to the side blocks access to the garden for any future works or services (such as window cleaning).
5. Other than a reference in the Design and Access Statement to the extension projecting 4.5m into the garden, no other measurements have been given. In particular, the proposed height of the flat roof is not recorded. This potentially allows for the building to be even higher than suggested by the rather vague plans.
6. Moreover, the plans suggest that the roof will be only marginally lower than the top of the existing pitched roof. This seems unnecessarily high. Indeed, comparison with the plans for the extension at 61 Lancaster Grove suggests that the proposed roof is higher than that at Number 61. This is out of keeping with the style of the area, and if permission is granted, I would ask that the proposal for the height of the roof be lowered, to make the highest point of the flat roof equal to the lowest point of the existing pitched roof, or at least no higher than the roof at Number 61. If the proposed height of the roof is due to the ground sloping away in the garden, the height of the room could be maintained by a step down into the extension.

Given the aforementioned failure of the extension at Number 61 to stick to the approved guidelines, should permission for this application be granted, there must be an emphasis on strict compliance with the plans, and this would be expected to be checked at an early stage during the progress of the works.

Further, should permission be granted, it is imperative that precautions be taken to ensure that the flat roof does not become a terrace directly outside the window of the First Floor Flat. This would lead to a great loss of privacy for the First Floor Flat.

It should moreover be recorded that contrary to the declaration made by Mr Mercer in ‘Certificate B’, I was never served notice of this application, and only became aware of it on 2nd January 2017, hence my late objection. His willingness to make a declaration is most troubling and does not give me confidence about the proposals generally.

I hope you will consider these points and refuse approval of the application.