

Application No:	Site Address:	Case Officer:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:
<b>East Area</b>					
2013/2520/P	8 Spring Place London NW5 3ER	Ben Le Mare	Miss Aphra Sklair	30/05/2013 09:32:51	OBJ

**Response:**

I object strongly to the proposed development: the back of my property is directly adjacent to the proposed development site, my property would be severely affected by the construction of three additional floors of residential flats. I would suffer from loss of daylight and sunlight on my terrace and bedrooms, and additionally my privacy would be severely compromised, as anyone in the flats would be able to see directly in to my bedroom windows. In addition, I am concerned about noise nuisance due to the construction process, and also night noise from the residents of the extra flats which would directly affect my bedrooms.

The planning application documents section relating to daylighting states: "The impact upon units adjacent to the site have been analysed and show that although height and scale of the proposed building will cause a level of overshadowing to the adjacent property at No.10 Spring Place, this building is not residential and so satisfy the relevant BRE Daylighting criteria." There is however no mention of the adjacent properties to the rear of the site on Grafton Road, which are indeed residential and will suffer from overshadowing and loss of daylight. The application documents also contain no views of the proposed development from the rear. These things suggest that the impact on the properties to the rear of the site has not been adequately considered.

The views of the proposed front of the development show that the building would be bright yellow, which would be completely out of keeping with the surrounding properties, which are brick, wood etc. - I am worried that the proposed building could turn out to be something of an eyesore.

In conclusion I strongly object to this application due to loss of daylight, privacy and noise nuisance affecting properties to the rear of the site, and the external appearance of the proposed building. I believe there has not been adequate consideration of the properties to the rear of the site.