

FAO Lauren Ford 3040 Planning Solutions team.

Dear Ms Ford

**Property : 142, Flat A ,Fleet Road NW3 2QX**

**Application Ref : 2023/3233/P**

We own Flat A, at 140 Fleet Road and received no notification of the above application. We only noticed details of the application on a post on the pavement earlier today and trust our objections will be taken into consideration. Our property is the mirror image of the applicant's property and we share the limited light between our properties at the rear. This application if granted would fill in the applicant's side of the rear out rigger at ground level.

We consider this application to be totally inappropriate on the following grounds:

1 In the Design and Access Statement point 1.0 it states "Proposed side and rear extension that will improve natural daylight within the property ..... ". It will have exactly the opposite effect on our property if the area between the outriggers is filled in. We will have a brick wall directly opposite our kitchen and bathroom windows just slightly over one metre away. Furthermore our bedroom window also looks out onto this area and the light to it will be seriously reduced.

2 At point 3 Design Summary - further reference is made to the light in the existing flat. "..... natural daylight to the kitchen/dining area, bathroom and bedroom is extremely limited." Their configuration is the same as ours and by their own admission the light is already "extremely limited". To replace the current dividing fence with a higher brick wall will considerably reduce our natural daylight into the same areas.

3 At Point 10 Conclusion – it is stated "Massing which does not negatively impact the neighbours in terms of daylight, sunlight or outlook". This statement is totally incorrect and in reality it is the opposite. We will be seriously affected in terms of light and outlook by having a brick wall greater than the length of the current three storey rear outrigger given the application includes extending to the rear. Furthermore the wall will be substantially higher than the existing fence and just over one metre away from our kitchen and bathroom windows.

4 At 7.0 Planning Precedent schemes - citing application reference 2020/5279/P as a precedent is erroneous. The decision in this case clearly states the light and outlook to the ground and upper floor windows would not be unduly compromised as in this application. We assume this is due to the fact that the adjacent property sits higher than the applicant's whereas in this case both properties are at the same level. We would further suggest that being able to cite only one other similar application indicates the current application is inappropriate.

We are sure you will appreciate our concerns at this application and sincerely hope you will reject it in its entirety.

Yours sincerely,

Michael and Teresita Cutting