



We are writing you with regard to planning application 2013/5694/P for development work at the Coach House at 17 Parkhill Road.

As the owner and residents of the 1st floor flat at 17 Parkhill Road, we are concerned about several aspects of the proposed extension, as follows:

The proposal envisages building on the wall of the terrace of the upper ground floor of 17 Parkhill Road.

- First, this is visibly not a party wall striding the boundary of the two properties (Coach House and [REDACTED] but is clearly inset from the property line between the two properties, meaning that the proposed extension thus encroaches onto the property of 17 Parkhill Road.
- Second, we are concerned that this terrace wall is not structurally sound enough to support the proposed extension, and thus could endanger the main building at 17 Parkhill Road structurally.

Furthermore, we are concerned that the glazed roof planned in the extension would throw light upwards onto our two rear bedroom windows overlooking the extension.

If you grant this planning application, you will be allowing an extension of a few meters based on line of sight logic on a coach house that is itself already an extension – how then could you logically ever deny a comparable extension to the 17 Parkhill Road main building, so that it then expands outwards by several more meters – and why couldn't adjoining or other neighbours do the same? Where does this stop? We bought our flat to live in Belsize Park, not Hong Kong.

We are also concerned about unforeseeable impacts of further build-up – note that the line of buildings on our side of Parkhill Road is bounded to the west by a large asphalted school playground (as shown in photograph 3.03c of the Design and Access Statement). We suspect that this has already contributed to an increased run-off of precipitation, which might be linked to the frequent drainage problems that have been experienced in recent years at 17 Parkhill Road and by our neighbours – in an area already prone to problems with subsidence. More development will possibly aggravate this, and also contributes to the loss of green space and wildlife diversity.

We also note a series of inaccuracies in the presentation, which we list here – we are concerned that this kind of carelessness might characterise more important aspects of the application. So in the Design and Access Statement, the following photographs are wrongly labelled:

3.02a is a view of 19 Parkhill Road, not 17

3.02b is a view of 15 Parkhill Road, not 17

3.02c is a view of 17 Parkhill Road, not 19

3.02g is a rear view of 17 and 15 Parkhill Road, not 13 and 15

3.02h is a view of the rear parapet of 17 Parkhill Road, not 15

3.02j is a view across the parapets of 17 and 19 Parkhill Road, not 19 and 21

3.02k is the garden terrace of 17 Parkhill Road, not 15

Finally, while this does not directly concern us, note that the planning application argument about blocking sunlight to 19 Parkhill Road using the Merton Council criteria fails to take into account one critical factor: the location of the sun. If these windows were for instance facing northeast, then meeting the 55° criterion would not mean much difference in the amount of available sunlight, since the 55° interference would block mainly light coming from the north, i.e. not much. But since the windows face west, the 55° blocked will mean the blockage of sunlight coming from the southwest, i.e. the afternoon sun, which will mean a qualitatively greater reduction in the total light received.

In light of all this, we are seriously concerned that due care to all the ramifications of the development have not fully been taken into account. (

P.S. We submitted a very slightly cut down version of this online to fit with the limit on the maximum number of characters.)

C Mortier and B Hamm-

