

| Application No: | Consultees Name:          | Consultees Addr:                    | Received:           | Comment: | Response:  |
|-----------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------|----------|------------|
| 2014/4129/P     | Paul & Natasha<br>Michell | 1 Dartmouth Park<br>Road<br>NW5 1SU | 03/08/2014 22:00:22 | OBJ      | Background |

1. We are Jennifer and Tim's immediate neighbours, at 11 Dartmouth Park Road ("DPR").
2. We have lived as a family at 11 DPR for nearly 10 years. We and our young children hope to live at 11 DPR for years to come.
3. We support the majority of Jennifer and Tim's plans. However, for the reasons given at para 8 below, we oppose the introduction of a terrace to the ground floor. We also have concerns, set out at para 9 below, about the proposed 'glass box' extension.
4. The key reasons for our opposition to the introduction of a terrace on the ground floor ("the terrace") are the intrusiveness/loss of privacy/noise disturbance which it would present.
5. Jennifer and Tim have a large garden. A terrace for 'outside space' (despite ownership of and access to the garden) is not needed, particularly given that (a) there is to be access to the garden from the proposed new dining area, and (b) the stairs to/from the garden are to be rebuilt (and thus could easily be designed to accommodate any mobility issues). See also para 7 below.

The Planning Design and Access Statement ("PDAS")

6. There are some inaccuracies in the PDAS. We mention them because as they appear in the PDAS, they must be thought relevant by the applicants:
  - a. History: As the PDAS says, Jennifer and Tim have lived at 9 DPR for over 50 years. This, and the fact that they are 'active' in the conservation area group, is of no or little relevance to the merits of their present application. The key issue is future usage of our two adjoining properties and the impact of the proposed works on (to quote from p 13 of the PDAS) "current and future occupiers".
  - b. Carers/staff: The application is presented on the basis that the lower ground floor will be used for carers/"staff", to assist Jennifer & Tim. For example, the Introduction to the PDAS states (p.2) that the separate side entrance is "for carers and staff", and (p12) that the lower ground will "provide accommodation for a live-in carer or nurse".
  - c. However, Jennifer expressly told us (most recently, in early July 2014) that her intention was to rent out the lower ground floor, so as to augment their income. We fully understand them taking the rental course- assuming it does not lead or amount to a 'change of use' and subdivision of the house (which would give us very serious concerns). However, for whatever reason, the PDAS does not accord with what Jennifer told us about usage of the lower ground floor.
  - d. Support for project: It is said at p.2 of the PDAS that "both neighbours of the adjoining properties... have offered informal support". As to this:

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

- i. Only our house physically adjoins with 9 DPR. For that reason, we are the household which will be most affected by the works (and in particular, the terrace).
- ii. Though we have told Jennifer that we are content with the majority of the works, we have made very clear to her that (in particular) we would oppose the making of the terrace, for the reasons set out below.
- iii. Jennifer has kindly said she understood our reasoning.

e. Inconsistent drawings: The drawings in the PDAS are often inconsistent as regards size/layout etc when depicting the terrace. (Though we have been shown rough sketches, Jennifer and Tim have not shared with us any detailed drawings of the proposed works.)

7. Outside access: The PDAS explains that part of the reason for the works is because Tim and Jennifer “find it difficult... to access the garden”. As to this, we understand and (both having elderly parents ourselves) sympathise with any access issues. However:

- a. See para 5 above.
- b. The stairs to the (proposed “shared”) garden are no less lengthy or steep than the main stairs to the front entrance of 9 DPR, which obviously will continue to be used by Jennifer & Tim on a very regular basis.
- c. The garden stairs present less of a challenge than the many internal stairs which are used to access the above-ground floors of the house (e.g. the bathrooms and bedrooms), which Tim and Jennifer will continue repeatedly to use each day.
- d. The stairs to the garden could readily be adapted to Tim & Jennifer’s needs so as to facilitate the access to ‘outside space’ which the terrace is supposed to provide.
- e. We note from p. 17 of the PDAS that new garden stairs are proposed anyway.

Reasons for objection

- 8. Roof terrace: We strongly object to the inclusion of the terrace, for the following reasons:
  - a. The terrace will inevitably create the potential for considerable noise disruption -from present or future occupiers of 9 DPR- as it is in an unsheltered and acoustically and visually exposed location right next to our house.
  - b. Noise pollution, visibility and loss of privacy will be increased by the fact that –because of the positioning of the door giving access to the terrace- the area on the terrace most likely to be used for sitting etc. is the area right next to our house.
  - c. The terrace would be situated very close to the only window of our main bedroom, which is on the

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

first floor at the rear of our house. Again, noise pollution is an obvious concern- especially when our bedroom window is open in hot months (i.e. roof terrace 'season').

d. The only window to our children's' bedroom is also at the rear of the house, on the top floor. The same concerns arise.

e. Our respective gardens are sheltered by a brick wall, which helps reduce noise and maintain privacy. Users of the terrace will be able to look directly down into our garden, spoiling its privacy.

f. The right hand edge of the terrace (looking at the terrace from the garden):

i. would be sited within about 5' from our ground floor sitting room window. This means that users of the terrace could look into our sitting room, and that noise pollution would again be likely;

ii. overlooks the large skylight into our lower floor sitting room. Again, this impacts on our family's privacy, because it means a roof terrace user would be able to look directly down into our lower ground seating area. (The drawing at p17 of the PDAS does not show the skylight.)

g. The terrace directly overlooks not only our garden, but also our patio area, immediately outside our lower floor extension. The patio area at present is very private, and not overlooked at all by any of our immediate neighbours (including No. 9). We really value this privacy, which would be lost.

h. The terrace directly looks (to the right) into the large window which is situated on the side wall of our 3 storey rear extension. (The drawing at p17 of the PDAS does not show our window.) This again creates privacy issues.

i. The proposal in the PDAS is to create a screen on the right hand edge of the terrace, which (it is said) would limit visibility to our house from the terrace. However, this screen:

i. would not prevent users of the terrace looking down onto our garden and into our patio area;

ii. if made of see-through glass, does not solve the problems set out at para 8 (f)-(h) above;

iii. if made of opaque material:

1. would have to be very high –and thus obtrusive and unattractive- to address the issues at para 8(f)-(h) above -the screen as shown at p19 of the PDAS appears to be 2+ metres high;

2. will block light into our lower ground floor sky light (and possibly our sitting room); and in any event

3. would not solve any of the noise problems set out above.

j. The screen as shown at p.19 of the PDAS stands on a (proposed?) elevated brick party wall which is presently not in situ. This further increases the likelihood of loss of light into our skylight.

k. The edge of the terrace would need to be enclosed, to prevent falls etc. We question how this will be done –there is nothing in the PDAS to explain the point- without masking/detracting from the ground floor period rear window.

l. Jennifer told us the proposed terrace would be about 1m deep. In fact, at least one drawing

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

submitted with the application suggests that the intention is to bring the terrace out to approximately the line of our side extension (i.e. at least about 2m). This would be wholly unnecessary and unacceptable.

9. As regards the proposed extension at 9 DPR, we object to the plans as presently formulated, for the following reasons:

a. The extension is very large. It appears from the plans that it will jut out much further than any other rear extensions on the road. If this is right, the size is out of proportion with neighbouring houses, in this conservation area.

b. The proposed extension is mostly made of glass. It is also on a level which overlooks the side of our property, as well as our garden. Because of this, and because of the size of the extension (which accommodates a living area which will be used a lot by the inhabitants of 9 DPR), we will be overlooked and privacy will be lost.

10. To conclude: We urge you not to allow the application as presently formulated, for the reasons set out above. There will be a serious and long-term impact on our use and enjoyment of 11 DPR if the terrace is built to accommodate Jennifer and Tim, whose stated issues can be met by adapting access to the garden. The extension proposal requires revision, for the reasons set out above.

Please let us know of the committee date.

---