

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2023/2179/P	Marcus Beard	11/08/2023 13:29:49	OBJ	<p>I have 3 areas of concern with the proposed redevelopment of 29 Inglewood Road and therefore object to the plans as they currently stand.</p> <p>1 Excavation of ground to construct new lower ground floor area along boundary with 31. Although the houses further up the street (at a higher level due to the slope in the road) have a full-width cellar, some converted for habitation, 29 has a partial cellar and 31 has no cellar at all. This must have been done for a reason – most likely poor quality of the ground. Without the necessary existing foundations, I'm not sure how the cellar can be extended without causing subsidence issues for 31 (which is end of terrace so has no adjoining house for support), especially around the two main shared chimneys which would be excavated under. There is no detail given in the planning application as to how this would be addressed. I would also point out that the ongoing development and excavation of 23 Inglewood Road further down the road has caused significant subsidence and other issues for the neighbouring property at 25 and they had an existing cellar so were just lowering the ground level.</p> <p>2 Right to Light. Bearing in mind the ground level of 31 is around 50cm lower than 29, the proposed rear extension would stand nearly 4m tall as viewed from the garden of 31 and block significant light from both garden and ground floor of 31, especially in the winter months when the sun is lower. The existing fence/trellis is much lower (c2.5m as from 31 ground level) and the plantings trimmed back in winter to get at much light as possible, but the extension would permanently block light. Given the living room to the rear of 31a has enjoyed light for over 120 years (the bay being the only windows to that room), a right to light has clearly been acquired under the Prescription Act (England and Wales) 1832 and would need to be preserved or an agreement reached.</p> <p>3 The boundary to the rear between 29 and 31 should be a straight line as shown on official Land Registry documents, and whilst there is currently a fence (put in by the previous owners of 29) with a "kink" in it as shown in the proposal documents, it would appear the rear extension would permanently encroach onto the rear of 31.</p>

---