

**Planning Application Number:** 2024/0328/P

**Site Address:** Flat 1, 33 Hillfield Road, London, NW6 1QD

## **OBJECTION**

I hereby **object** to this planning application.

I am the owner and occupier of the property, Basement Flat, 31 Hillfield Road, which is an immediately adjacent property to the proposed site.

The proposed application must be refused at least because it causes loss of amenity to neighbouring properties, including loss of light, increased flood risk, and loss of privacy.

The proposal fails to consider the impact on my property. In fact, the proposal neglects to indicate the existence of my property at all. The proposal withholds relevant information from the council that would negatively affect the application.

As indicated in the plan, the proposal involves building an extension on the site right up to the boundary with the neighbouring property to the west, 31 Hillfield Road (e.g., see Proposed Ground Floor Plan, page 1 of the Proposed Drawings). A significant section of the proposed extension is adjacent my property (Basement Flat, 31 Hillfield Road).

The proposal only refers to the neighbouring property when indicating that the “neighbouring garden” height is slightly higher (e.g., see Proposed Rear Elevation, page 4 of the Proposed Drawings). This refers to the garden of the ground floor flat of 31 Hillfield Road. This rather disingenuously omits the fact that, behind this, is the rear garden of my basement flat.

My property is a basement flat, located below the ground level of the property of the proposal. My property includes a rear patio garden as indicated in the attached floorplan (Annex A) and shown in the attached photo (Annex B).

My rear garden is bounded on the west side by a brick wall of the principal bedroom of my property. This wall includes a window into the principal bedroom, as indicated in the attached photo (Annex B). The rear garden is bounded on the south side by a brick wall of the second bedroom of my property. This wall includes patio double doors, as indicated in the attached photo (Annex C). The rear garden is bounded on the north side by a retaining wall that extends up to the ground level of the ground floor flat of 31 Hillfield Road. A metal fence with open railings lines this barrier, as shown in the attached photo (Annex B). The east side of my rear garden forms the boundary with the site of the proposal, 33 Hillfield Road. This boundary currently includes a wooden fence, as shown in the attached photos (Annex B and Annex D).

The proposed application must be refused at least because it causes loss of light, increased flood risk, and loss of privacy to my property, as explained below.

### Loss of Light

The proposal will cause significant loss of light to my property.

The proposal includes building a brick wall (defining the western edge of the extension) right up to the boundary with my property. The proposed wall will run along the east side of my rear garden.

The plan indicates a wall height of 3 m from the ground level of 33 Hillfield Road. However, that ground level is significantly higher than the ground level of my basement flat. The proposed wall will increase the height significantly compared to the current fence. Doing so will enclose the rear garden fully on 3 sides. This will cause unallowable overshadowing of my property.

The proposed wall also extends northwards beyond my rear garden, to 4.42 m as indicated on the plan. This will further block light from the north side of my rear garden (as can be seen from Annex B).

This proposal will lead to an unacceptable loss of light. Currently, the sunlight not only provides light into my rear garden, but also crucially provides the only natural source of light into the two bedrooms of the basement flat property. These rooms are also used during the day, including as a home office, and therefore daytime light is critical.

As shown on the Proposed Rear Elevation (page 4 of the Proposed Drawings), my patio doors are located below the ground level indicated (and beneath the window of the ground floor flat that can be partially seen). The proposed extension does not meet the 45-degree rule of assessing loss of light, since a 45 degree line from the corner of the extension (against our boundary), would cut through the window of the ground floor flat, let alone our patio doors below this. The patio doors below the ground floor flat window are shown in Annex C.

The proposal is **overly intensive** by extending right out to the boundary, overlooking our rear garden, and causing loss of light.

The proposal must be refused for at least this reason.

#### Flood Risk

As mentioned, the proposal involves building the extension right up to the boundary with my property. Developing this full area will significantly reduce the ability of the land to adequately drain water. My property has historically had flooding issues in the principal bedroom due to inadequate drainage of groundwater, and we have conducted significant works to repair this. The proposal will decrease the land area available for drainage. Reducing the ability for adequate surface drainage will cause an unacceptable flood risk to my property.

The proposal is **overly intensive** by extending right out to the boundary without any consideration for the impact on the neighbouring property, especially in relation to flood risk.

The proposal must be refused for at least this reason.

#### Loss of Privacy

The proposal also indicates an enclosed inner courtyard (e.g., see Proposed Side Elevation, page 4 of the Proposed Drawings). However, the proposal lacks any indication of the nature of the proposed boundary between the properties at this location. The Proposed First Floor Plan (page 2 of the Proposed Drawings) indicates a boundary structure (indicated by black parallel lines and filled in white), but this is different to the brick wall of the extension (filled in grey). It must therefore be assumed that the intention is to not have a brick wall in this location. However, the proposal lacks any details of this. If this boundary is not closed, this will cause unacceptable overlooking and loss of privacy directly into my rear garden and with direct line of sight into the principal bedroom window.

The proposal must be refused for at least this reason.

Summary

The proposal fails to mention or consider my immediately adjacent property at all. The proposal will cause unacceptable impact on my property and loss of amenity. For all of the above reasons, the proposed application must be refused.

Leonard Wright and Suzannah Boddy

Basement Flat, 31 Hillfield Road

## Hillfiled Road, NW6









