

Comments on application 2016/1982/P: Erection of part 1, part 2 storey extension and installation of terrace at second floor level to rear of property (from Dr. R. Stanwell-Smith, 60 Agamemnon Road)

My property adjoins, at ground floor, no. 62. It is currently classified as a semi-detached house. While sympathetic to my neighbours' wish to acquire more space at their property, I object to this proposal as it stands. My concerns are:

1. **This is in many ways a joint property with mine.** We share a pathway, garage, drive and are joined at the ground floor. We also share a common water main and have shared location of electricity and gas meters. Numbers 60 and 62 were built together c1988 as an infilling on a corner plot. There may be structural reasons why no. 62 was not built up at the back. If the proposed major development at no. 62 goes ahead, it will dwarf and darken my property which has already suffered from an extension at no. 69 with a high brick walled 'conservatory' obscuring the front door and only window on the ground floor – and additional loss of light from the rear extension in the previous loft development at no. 62. Building onto the party wall will convert my house into an end of terrace. Thus the **height and size of the proposed development** will completely alter the character and enjoyment of my house and could damage it structurally. The plans take no account of the effect on my property and the front elevation is particularly misleading, appearing to show that the gap between the houses would be preserved – this is contradicted by plans for 1st floor and loft.
 2. **Opportunity for joint extensions at nos. 60 and 62.** I have had to consider that this application or a modified version may be successful. I propose that this would only be reasonable if we undertake loft conversions jointly, with jointly agreed plans. This would partly restore the height discrepancy proposed in the current application and would allow no. 62 an additional storey. It would allow better management of the party wall and proper attention to any implications for the foundations and other structural matters. I think I should be forced to consider loft extension in any case if this application goes ahead, which would be much more difficult after the storeys are built at no. 62. A joint building venture would also be less disruptive to neighbours in that all the building work would be completed at around the same time.
 3. **1st floor party wall problems.** Currently the 1st floor of no. 60 has an outer wall separate from no. 62. This allows ventilation from the bathroom and also makes my 1st floor study quiet. I would need evidence of very good sound-proofing and measures for ventilation, waste pipes etc.
 4. **The large proposed roof terrace** would be intrusive and noisy – currently my garden is not overlooked. The proposed roof terrace at no. 62 will be above the height of my roof.
-

