19, Rosecroft Avenue London NW3 7QA

Your Ref: 2014/6435P

Niall Sheehan Esq Regeneration & Planning Development Management London Borough of Camden Town Hall Judd Street London WC1H 8ND

2nd December 2014

PLANNING APPLICATION RE: 21 ROSECROFT AVENUE NW3 7QA

Dear Sir,

I am writing in connection with the Planning Application 2014/6453/P submitted by my neighbours.

I would like to again raise objections to the proposal that will have an adverse effect on my amenity and in particular effect on the daylight received on my second floor window on the rear of the property. In my letter dated 28.07.14 I raised concerns over the extension at first floor level; these concerns did not appear to have received much consideration

It would seem that the neighbouring extension is developing by stealth over a number of applications because previous efforts to apply for a two storey extension have failed.

I note from the plans that they show a 45 degree line on the first floor from the extension to our window, but none on the second floor. This is curious to note because our window is much closer to the proposed extension on the second floor. Clearly the natural light to our window will be affected at second floor level. I wonder if this omission is by error or design. I appreciate this is not necessarily a Planning Issue and further action would have to be taken , should this proposal be approved.

It was clearly stated in the Planning Statement that observations were previously made in the previous application for works at first floor level. This application only exacerbates the situation. I would therefore like our objections in this regard to be considered.

The window serves the staircase providing access to the second floor rooms, but now Natural light would be reduced at both first and second floor levels reducing amenity

to what is currently a light airy staircase that forms a fundamental role of a multi storey house.

The present two houses have exsisted since the lat 1950's, the ethos of the design was:

- a) To ensure the front and the rear of the house benefited from daylight
- b) The rear of the house benefited from an unimpeded view of the gardens
- c) Though the houses are semi detached, when inside the house, one does not have the sense of the neighbouring house.

I suggest this application exacerbates to an unreasonable level the situation caused by Planning Permission 2014/4402/P with no corresponding benefit.

I have very serious concerns over the implications on the structure for this two storey extension, I appreciate this is not a Planning matter and will need serious review under the Party Wall Act.

I would be grateful if these observations could be considered as part of the descision Process,

Yours faithfully,

E.R.BRENNER cc: SD