

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7160/P	Stefan Mark Ogden	93b Bay Tree Lodge Frognaal London NW3 6XX	12/12/2014 04:57:26	OBJ	<p>Dear Ms Ampona,</p> <p>I am the owner of the first floor flat at Baytree Lodge which has windows to a kitchen and bedroom facing the application site.</p> <p>I wish to object to this planning application as I believe it will adversely affect both the daylight, privacy and general aspect to my south-facing rooms.</p> <p>These two houses at 7 & 8 Oak Hill Park Mews are already overbearing when viewed from my flat (I will ask my architect to send you some photos) and they have rooms at a distance of less than 9m facing my main bedroom window.</p> <p>This distance means you can see everything the other person is doing and I understand, is a much closer distance than is allowed.</p> <p>I think the original development would never be allowed under present planning rules.</p> <p>No.8 has already been extended with a 2nd floor extension added following planning consent in 2004. This was deliberately set back to ensure that the daylight to Baytree Lodge to the north was not affected.</p> <p>I understand that the daylighting rules require the successive effect of such extensions to be taken into account and not just that of the currently proposed incremental increase.</p> <p>With the adjacent walls of Baytree Lodge to the east and the overhanging tree to the west, this building already completely dominates the skyline from these windows as the attached photos show.</p> <p>Please come and see for yourself.</p> <p>It leaves just a small gap between it and the much older south wing of Baytree Lodge as can be seen from the attached photos.</p> <p>The proposal also include two new larger windows with low sill height to replace the present slot windows that are above eye level on the second floor.</p> <p>The proposals will harm both my property, my privacy, the neighbouring flats and the surrounding Conservation Area by turning a series of smaller volumes into a single large box.</p> <p>The photo from the north in the Design and Access Statement does not show the corresponding view of the proposal.</p> <p>I therefore attach my own interpretation of what the elevational drawings show on the same PDF as the existing so the change can be easily seen by jumping between the two.</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

The left-hand side of the second floor of No.8 is being filled in and brought forward so as to cut out the main piece of visible sky visible from my windows that are much closer than this view.

There is no daylight study attached to the application to show the effect on my windows and those of the habitable rooms at ground floor level (Flat No.93) nor of the accumulative effect of the successive extensions.

The drawings submitted with the application are inadequate for showing the proposals in context.

Those labelled 'sections' have no obvious heavier section lines or shading to show what is in section with all lines shown at the same weight whether in section or elevation.

They also fail to show the adjacent walls and windows of Bay Tree Lodge. Nor do they show the dotted outline of the existing section (such as on section BB) so that a comparison can readily be made.

The existing section BB is taken at its largest point just missing the recess next to No.7 so that the apparent change is minimised.

I attach an extended east elevation to correct this.

The Planning Statement makes much of the fact that the planning inspector at the recent Appeal did not specifically state his objection to the 2nd floor extensions.

It is clear that the whole added 3rd floor extension was so overbearing in conception that the minor in-fill extensions at 2nd floor level were by contrast not given the same attention.

The absence of specific comment does not imply approval or acceptance of them.

When the previous application was submitted in 2012 you consulted over 30 nearby properties affected by the proposals: I cannot see on your website who has been consulted this time but trust that a similar circulation has been done.

Yours sincerely

Stefan Ogden
