

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3926/P	Pamela Roditi	18/12/2023 08:53:00	OBJ	

Dear Ms Dawson,

Please see below my Letter of Objection regarding 14 Cannon Place NW3 1EJ, Planning and Listed Building Consents Applications, ref: 2023/3926/P and 2023/4992/L. The same letter has been submitted to the Camden planning portal.

I have retained the expert advice of Lichfields, Planning and Heritage Consultants, and they will make a separate submission on the Application on my behalf.

I would like to ask you to take in consideration my Objection and to let me know when the application will be determined according to your terms of reference.

Please note that I was only made aware about the above planning application because of the site notice outside our house in the street, but I never received a Notification letter from the planning authorities advising me about the application, and I wonder if other neighbours are aware of this application.

Best regards,

Pamela Roditi

Date: 18 December 2023

Your Ref: 2023/3926/P and 2023/4992/L

Dear Ms Dawson

14 Cannon Place London Camden NW3 1EJ – Letter of Objection

Planning and Listed Building Consents Applications ref: 2023/3926/P and 2023/4992/L

Thank you for consulting us in respect of the planning and listed building applications submitted on behalf of the owner of 14 Cannon Place NW3 1EJ.

I, Pamela Roditi, am the owner and occupier of 12 Cannon Place, London NW3 1EJ. I have owned and occupied the property with my family since 1996.

I have retained the expert advice of Lichfields, Planning and Heritage Consultants, to advise me on the Planning Application and they will make a separate submission to you on some of the technical aspects of the referenced Planning Application.

12 Cannon Place is a grade II* listed house located adjacent (to the west) of the application site (14 Cannon Place). It is a two/ three storey house set back from the road behind a long front garden. The building line at no. 12 is set further back from the street than at 14 Cannon Place, with the front elevation at no.12 sitting behind the rear elevation of no. 14.

My concerns on the proposed extension of the rear conservatory touch upon the impact and loss of natural light, both sunlight and moonlight, as well as the impact on the outlook affecting the only window located on the ground floor facing east, caused by the additional mass (height and depth) of the proposed extension

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:****Comment:** **Response:**

blocking off half the window on the eastern wall of the house. Although this window /skylight serves a small scullery, it lends precious light and outlook into the centre of the house and into a highly utilised small living room.

By way of historical background, the arrangements between 12 and 14 Cannon Place were settled by a Deed of Mutual Covenant dated 31 March 1915 and registered on the Title Deeds which carefully settled the arrangements between the two properties. At that date, a skylight window was installed above the then existing window to enhance the light availability and outlook from the east end of my house. This historic feature is being seriously and substantially degraded by the proposed development.

At the same time, it is worth mentioning that the daylight and outlook from the front terrace/garden of 12 Cannon Place were seriously negatively impacted by the construction of a flanking wall when the existing conservatory was built on 14 Cannon Place in about 1990 (TBC). This substantially reduced the amount of sunlight received by, and the outlook of the sky from, the front terrace/garden of 12 Cannon Place, which was already enclosed by the historic flank elevations of nos 14 and 10 Cannon Place. The now proposed partial blocking of the window into the scullery/hallway/living room by the further extension of that conservatory would be a further substantial diminution of the amenity of light, aspect, and outlook from 12 Cannon Place as a result of the proposed building work.

We are keen to stress, that our principal objection to the proposed development would be largely addressed if the proposed rear extension was reduced in depth by one window bay (circa 1.25m) so that it was pulled back from the line of the side facing window at no. 12. This would reduce the impact of the extension on the outlook and sense of enclosure at our property and would make it more proportionate/ subservient to the footprint of the main listed building.

Lichfields will make a separate submission on the Application on my behalf, particularly as it does not consider any potential effect of the proposal on the subterranean cellar (originally a coal store) which is physically connected to and accessed from my Grade II* listed property and which will lie below the proposed extension in the garden of No.14, as well as raising other technical issues and omissions in the Application. We trust that this objection will be taken into account by Officers in their consideration and determination of the Planning Application.

Yours Sincerely

P A Roditi