



Dear Mr Fowler,
As freeholders of [REDACTED] we object to this revision to the application. Had we been made aware of the original application we would have objected to that also, however we were not given an opportunity to comment.

If you look at the history of this building-
In 1997 two flats were added to No 108, a further one in 1998 by converting a garage to the rear.
In 2003 two further flats were added and a 1-bed enlarged to a 3-bed, the address of 4/47 Ingham road being created
In 2018 planning granted for three further flats
now in 2019 application for another.

On the other side, at number 104, in 2012 a large building has been erected in what was the rear garden, and planning has been granted to lift the roof-line to redevelop and expand also.

For us this is too much;

The light and outlook of our property is being reduced, our privacy reduced.

We are concerned about the integrity of the foundations, these Victorian properties are built on clay with shallow foundations, they were not designed for the extra weight, nor are the sewers. We see no signs of a structural engineers report on this.

There is no provision for waste bin storage.

There is no car parking space, for residents or visitors alike.

Aesthetically, from the front the roofline will make our property look like a missing tooth!

The disruption from building works simultaneously on both sides for an extended period will be detrimental to our right of peaceful use of our property, both for the flat above and the dental surgery below.

As the leaseholder of our upper flat has pointed out to you, such development is not for the owners own use but selfishly for maximising profits; they do not live in the area and will not suffer the consequences. We have lived and worked here for 50 years and the area has been changed out of all recognition, losing its character and style; this is very disappointing to all residents.

yours sincerely,

Nicholas and Judith Grasse.