



Dear Ms Wheat,

I notice that the photographs with my objection to planning application 2016/1115/P are cropped where they appear on the website. I am therefore sending my objection again with smaller photos so that the whole picture can be seen. Would you please put these smaller photos on the website.

I would also like to point out that the 'Comment until' date on this application is incorrect. In Stuart Minty's email of 15 March, he said that the consultation period was going to be extended by 21 days. Prior to that it was 23rd March, this extension would make it mid-April, but it is currently 1st April (which is only 8 days). Would you be kind enough to rectify this.

Regards,
Julia Rosier

re. 24a Edis Street

I object to the revised application 2016/1115/P on the grounds it will be far more detrimental to my studio flat at Ground, 24(B) Edis Street, than even the original application to which I also objected.

The original permission (2015/2571/P) was given for one height ONLY, that of 2150mm. Carlos Martin (CM) only mentioned for the first time a second figure of 2410mm (where the conservatory attaches to the wall underneath my window) AFTER the permission was granted and I strongly object to this figure being introduced retrospectively. In his own Delegated Report, Members' Briefing, page 3 under heading Assessment Proposal No.1, CM says 'the proposed conservatory would be (...) 2.1m high by 2.7m wide approx'. (There is currently an investigation in place into the handling of this matter.) To put one height on a drawing where the slope is almost imperceptible is misleading. In the absence of a second figure the measurement of 2150mm should be applied to the conservatory at its highest point, therefore reducing the height at the garden end.

I object to this application on the following basis:

1. The outlook from my flat will be even more diminished. At the garden elevation of the structure the difference in height between the 2150mm (of the existing permission) and the 2300mm (of the new application) is 15cm (6 inches) and at the wall it will be 325mm (13 inches), which will have a huge impact on my outlook. The original Delegated Report was wrong to say it 'would not result in loss of greenery' (see photo 1 below). There is already a loss of greenery with the existing permission, but this loss will be increased by the new application. Someone of 6'4" will tower over someone of 5'10" and, as my outlook is across the length and breadth of the glass roof, this difference of 6" at the garden end of the extension is hugely detrimental and will largely obliterate the last greenery that can be seen from my flat. There was never a reduction in the height at the garden end of the construction to 2119mm as CM stated in his email of 15 February and it is not just about a difference of 'a few millimetres' as CM stated in his email of 16 February. This is a substantial increase to the existing permission with detrimental consequences for my property.

2. This does not damage the outlook for the owner of the flat above mine, 24c, who has a very different birds-eye view of the construction.
3. This amended application increases substantially the light pollution to my flat. Opaque glass may obscure the visibility of those inside the structure, but a great deal of light will still emanate from it. A structure that will already create light pollution, therefore, will be brought 325mm (13 inches) closer to the window of my studio flat and sleeping area. If the light is left on in the conservatory during the night, it will illuminate my studio above and interfere with sleep (see photo 3). I am already concerned about the amount of light pollution from the first permission, but to bring the structure another 13 inches closer to my window will be massively intrusive.
4. Likewise, there will be more noise pollution by the increased volume of this structure, which will amplify any sound 13 inches closer to my window.
5. A flat roof structure, which is naturally implied when only one height was given on the original application (2150mm), would give more access to the back of the house in the event work needs to be done to pipes or brickwork in the future. Permission was given for only one height that of 2150mm. This proposed sloping glass roof will have an impact on access. (The wall of no 23 has been repointed in the last few weeks - see photo 3/top lefthand corner - and my wall needs repointing, but there will be no access to it if the glass roof is sloped.) I object to the new proposed sloping roof, as a flat roof is more practical.
6. There is a flat roofed glass structure at basement level at 51 Princess Road, which backs onto the gardens of the houses in Edis Street (see photo 2). The flat roof is built at the same height as was granted in the original application for 24a Edis Street (i.e. 2150mm). I object to the new proposed height of this application, as the height of 2150mm of the existing permission is more reasonable.
7. On the plan, this is the first time that my waste pipes have been shown as appearing within the conservatory space (as opposed to above its roof), but they are still not drawn accurately.
8. The owner is intending to box in my waste pipes, but I object to them being boxed in on the grounds that I will not be able to get to them in an emergency and will not be able to reconfigure my bathroom should I, or anyone else, want to at some later date (see photo 1). If this application is granted it will be interfering with my amenities. (The pipes of my neighbour at 24c are not affected in the same way by this application, as they are not going to be boxed in by the conservatory.)
9. It is my intention to develop my flat and this new application, if granted, will make it impossible for me to make improvements to my property.
 - (a) I am intending to move my bathroom furniture, but my waste pipes will be boxed in and inaccessible thereafter.
 - (b) I am also intending to move my kitchen to the opposite side of my flat and, if the height of the structure is raised, that will be impossible too.
 - (c) To compensate for my loss of outlook resulting from the existing permission and to enable me to reintroduce some greenery into my outlook, I had intended to have a Juliet balcony. This would change my perspective; instead of looking down onto a large expanse of glass I would be looking across it as is the case at 51 Princess Road (see photo 2).The existing permission will not stop me from making these improvements, but if this new application is granted it will be impossible for me to make any of these improvements.
10. The conservatory should remain within the boundaries of the basement flat, including at its highest point where it joins the back wall. We have been given three different heights for the basement flat, floor to ceiling: 2410mm, 2306mm and 2475mm. My calculation is that the basement flat is 2100mm. This measurement is crucial to establishing where the joists are and despite many requests, this has never been verified. If this measurement is not accurate there is a risk that my flat will be overlapped and my space invaded.

11. The owner of 24a whilst increasing the value of their property, will be devaluing mine again.
12. The quality of life at my flat will be seriously affected by these changes as will the enjoyment of it.
13. A RSJ has already been erected not only above the height of the permission granted, but also above the increased height of the present application. It was inserted into my bathroom wall without discussion or party wall agreement (see photo 1).
14. The plans still lack detail, are inaccurate in part and are incomplete. (As was the case with the original application where the measurement of 2410mm was added after permission was granted as if it had always been there. I have print-outs of before and after versions to corroborate this, as well as witnesses). There is no detail on how this structure will actually look, what materials will be used, what the garden doors will look like (frames, height of doors, etc), what insulation is going to be used and what specification for the glazing or how the glazing will navigate around the pipes.
15. Consideration should also be given to the neighbours in Princess Road who will, if the permission is granted, be looking into the clear glass doors of this elevated structure and experience glare from a sloping roof.

I object to this new application and feel the existing permission with roof to a height of 2150mm is more acceptable.

Julia Rosier
Ground, 24 Edis Street

photo 1



photo 2



photo 3

