

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7054/P	Mary Cane	80 Burghley Road NW51UN	08/02/2017 16:38:17	OBJEMAIL	I object to this proposed development: 1. It is over development of an already dense site 2. The development will lead to loss of amenity (daylight through roof lights) to the existing top floor occupiers 3. loss of light and privacy to occupiers of adjacent terraces in Burghley Road
2016/7054/P	Sue Fyvel	Flat 7 Burghley Court 16-18 Ingestre Rd London NW5 1UF	07/02/2017 23:29:31	OBJ	My husband Michael Adler and I are the owners of one of the top floor flats. My reasons for objecting are : 1. Amenities are already overcrowded in the block.i.e Narrow staircases and insufficient bike storage, & already cramped access to meters. 2. Loss of skylights, a unique design feature of our top floor flats leading to loss of light in our flats and stairwell 3.It will be unsightly , raising height of block beyond others in area.Out of keeping with the area generally turning a building which blends in to one which will look out of proportion, particularly given its lack of any frontage I.e it abuts straight onto the street 4.Casting shadow and cutting light from ground floor flats of Wardlow.
2016/7054/P	Sue Fyvel	Flat 7 Burghley Court 16-18 Ingestre Rd London NW5 1UF	07/02/2017 23:29:28	OBJ	
2016/7054/P	Andrea Beetison	92a Burghley Road NW5 1UN	07/02/2017 15:17:43	COMMEMP ER	i strongly object to the above application. The current building is in perfect proportion with the victorian terrace it nestles next to .As you approach Burghley Court from Dartmouth Park Hill, the buildings appear terraced ,with Burghley court in the foreground , Wardlow slightly higher then Tideswell behind that . To raise the profile of the building will cut out this aspect as well as cutting light and skyline .The openness that i look out from in my flat will be lost .

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7054/P	Rea Maragno	91 Burghley Road NW5 1UH	08/02/2017 11:19:19	INT	<p>I strongly object to the proposed addition of a 5th floor to Burghley Court.</p> <p>I am writing to you as the freehold owner of 91 Burghley Road NW5 1UH which directly adjoins Burghley Court, and, also as occupant and owner of 2 of the flats which are most affected by the proposed development, as regards loss of daylight/ sunlight, privacy and an overall loss of amenity that seriously limits our living conditions in these two flats: the ground floor maisonette at the back of the building and the basement/garden flat, where my son, Marco Maragno, lives.</p> <p>There are 5 separate flats at 91 Burghley Road, each of which is occupied and all are variously affected by the proposed development.</p> <p>I have the following comments and objections to make:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. At the present time my objections are based on the current documentation and I refer to the serious omissions of the three affected windows of the Garden flat, from the Daylight and Sunlight Report produced by Point Surveyors. There should be, at garden or ground level, a window and a glazed door which access the garden and provide the only daylight to the living area in the flat and, indirectly to the kitchen which has no window (I attach related photos to be placed on public view).</li> <li>2. A further relevant window omitted from the Report is the skylight in the ground floor study which is part of the Garden flat, but accessed at street level from the front of the house. The only source of direct natural light and access to a little sky for the study is that skylight. A further storey would also impact on the skyline which is currently very limited in any case.</li> <li>3. As regards the Maisonette whose windows are listed in Sections 8.14 - 8.19 of the Daylight Report, we strongly disagree with the report's observation that we will not notice changes in our existing levels of light. ANY loss of daylight in this and the Garden flat is unacceptable as the proposed additional storey significantly reduces what is already very limited available light to the two flats. Any numerical assessment of light loss does not take into account how precious and essential is the little available light that we do have.</li> <li>4. A further loss that relates to all 5 flats in the building but is particularly relevant to the Maisonette and Garden flat is the "visible sky". Both these flats suffer from very limited outlook, so even the small area of sky that is currently visible from the 2 flats is a vital amenity.</li> <li>5. We were all concerned about the impact of the height of Burghley Court both on adjoining dwellings and on the overall visual impact on the area when the developers applied for permission to erect the current building back in 2002/3. They wished to put in an extra storey at the time, and the council took into account the adverse impact of this on neighbours such as us and on the area in general and refused the extra storey. I do not see why permission should be granted now, especially as we at 91 Burghley Road have already been adversely affected by the original construction of Burghley Court, which has</li> </ol>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>deprived us of essential daylight and obscured the visible sky at all levels of the building, thus affecting all five flats.</p> <p>6. The raising of the height of Burghley Court will create a sense of enclosure and feeling of being “hemmed in” that also affects our use of the Maisonette roof terrace at the back of the house and of the back garden. Furthermore there are issues of privacy, as we believe that the new balconies will allow users to look on to our back garden and roof terrace.</p> <p>7. In relation to the overall aspect of Burghley Road with its Victorian terraces, a further storey would intrude upon the skyline and the increased height would jar further with the adjoining terraces on our side of the the road.</p> <p>8. With reference to the Council’s “Core strategy policy CS5” which requires new developments to protect the amenity of residents within the Borough and Policy DP26 which builds on the core strategy to protect the privacy of existing dwellings such as ours, I ask the council to consider these when looking at my comments.</p> <p>I am aware of the pressure to provide “Affordable Housing” but do not believe this is the case here, so I must urge you to allow the basic rights of existing residents to prevail over the proposed development and to reject the application in full.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>Rea Maragno</p>

---

2016/7054/P	Paul Sparrow	First Floor Flat 91 Burghley Road London NW5 1UH	04/02/2017 12:51:18	COMMNT	<p>I wish to OBJECT to this planning application.</p> <p>I have lived in the 1st Floor flat at 91 Burghley Road, for many years ie. prior to the initial development of the site now known as Burghley Court.</p> <p>At that time the planning application was for a higher building. However that application was scaled back by one floor. NONETHELESS, the loss of my amenity was profound -</p> <p>1. The PANORAMIC VISTA from my kitchen was significantly reduced. 2. VISIBLE SKY was reduced and 3. LIGHT LOSS was profound.</p> <p>Similarly but even more profound was the effect on my bathroom.</p> <p>The current planning proposal will exacerbate the above; plus, there will be LOSS OF PRIVACY.</p> <p>No further loss of amenity is acceptable and I strongly urge you to reject this application.</p>
-------------	--------------	---	---------------------	--------	---

---