

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|--|
| 2023/4302/P | Mrs Lesley David | 05/12/2023 09:55:21 | OBJ | <p>I would like to object to the extent of the front (East) living room extension. It protrudes out from my adjacent wall creating an alcove on the North side of the front elevation of my property. This would reduce the light levels in what is my kitchen window.</p> <p>I would like to draw your attention to my historical planning application no. 8905432 dated 30th May 1989 which was refused because the proposed extension would extend excessively beyond the front wall of my neighbour's (29A Frognal) property. The revised application no. 9005411 which was granted, is the current front of my property.</p> <p>Additionally, I object to the flat roofs of the front extensions. They are not in keeping with the current elevations of the whole terrace.</p> |
| 2023/4302/P | 27 Arkwright Road RTM Co Ltd | 12/12/2023 10:44:07 | PETITNOBJ E | As neighbours in close proximity to this site we wish to object to this proposed Application which would involve building on green garden land. This is specifically not allowed in the Council's Conditions and would destroy valuable nature habitat. |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|--|
| 2023/4302/P | John and Tania Varsanyi | 05/12/2023 12:21:43 | OBJ | For Attention of Sam Fitzpatrick, Planning Officer at London Borough of Camden |

Dear Mr Fitzpatrick,

28.11.2023

Re: Planning Application No 2023/4302/P (29a Frognal. NW3 6AR)

As the owners and occupiers of 27a Frognal, NW3 6AR, we wish to strongly object to the following aspects of the proposed works to 29a Frognal.

1. Front Extension: By extending beyond the adjacent front wall of number 29 Frognal, the proposed ground floor front extension will, by putting number 29's window in a recess, have a significant negative impact on visibility from, and access of light to, 29's kitchen, and in our opinion should be limited to extending out towards the road no further than the immediately adjacent front wall of 29. Beyond this it will also adversely affect the appearance of the terrace as a whole.

2. Rear Extension: While understanding the desire to maximize floor area we feel that the proposed rear extension is excessive in extent and will adversely impact the adjoining properties in the terrace (27a and 29 Frognal).

Given that the site is already 1.0m or so higher than 27a and 29, even allowing for the fact that the extension will be 3.6m from the boundary with No 29 to the south, the 3m length from the house and 3.7m additional height will, to 27a and 29, be hugely overbearing, unduly dominant, and extremely intrusive visually over the outlook to the North, and, contrary to para 5.18 of the Planning Statement, negatively affect the amenity of adjacent occupiers regarding privacy, daylight/sunlight and outlook.

With reference to this we would like to draw your attention to the Planning Statement para 5.17 which states "It is also relevant to note that further along the terrace block, at number 27b, a rear extension (conservatory) has been constructed. This was granted planning permission on 17th November 2003. This demonstrates that the Council has previously granted planning permission for a rear extension on this terraced block, and therefore a further rear extension would not appear incongruent in this location."

What that statement fails to mention is that 27(b) Frognal site is 1.0 – 1.5m lower than that of 27a and 29, so the impact of the conservatory extension, which is already smaller than the proposed rear extension to number 29a, is reduced rather than increased. While the proposed rear extension to 29a may not, on paper, appear incongruent, its location on a site elevated above the rest of the terrace suggests to us that it is indeed incongruent when considered in relation to the amenity of the rest of the terrace to the south. In that context it will definitely be hugely overbearing and intrusive.

3. Drainage: We are most concerned that drainage pipes common to the terrace run through the rear gardens, with access via manholes in each of those gardens, and would appreciate confirmation that any extension/works to the rear of 29a will not compromise that drainage system and that a new manhole would

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

be provided outside any extension that enables access to those drains when the occupants are away from home.

Yours sincerely,

John and Tania Varsanyi.
27a Frognal, NW3 6AR
