

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1361/P	David Pitt-Watson	23 Dartmouth Park Road NW5 1SU	18/04/2017 15:03:10	OBJ	<p>We wish to object to this planning application which regards the property adjoining ours.</p> <p>We have two principle objections. First the inaccuracies in the drawings and proposal. Second, the general nature of the proposal, which will encroach upon our privacy, light and outlook. We believe it could establish a precedent for over-development.</p> <p><b>INACCURACIES IN THE PROPOSAL</b></p> <p>These relate both to drawings of the existing building and the proposed development. For example, the existing drawing appears to exaggerate the distance between the new development and the window of our sitting room. This might lead planners to underestimate the impact (including loss of light and light pollution) of a large structure built up against our boundary. On the proposal and drawings there are inconsistencies in window sizes and positions.</p> <p>This in turn raises other concerns. What material is the structural opaque glass? (This is hardly a common building material in the area.)</p> <p>With inaccurate and incomplete plans we cannot be confident that we have a comprehensive picture of the envisaged building.</p> <p>The text of the Design and Access statement also lacks accuracy. The “historic pattern of closet extension” is original to the semi-detached buildings which make up most of the street; not to the terraced houses, of which this is one. Some permissions for in-fill between them may have been given, but this is hardly a “historic pattern”. And in any case number 25 is a terrace with no such extension. Incidentally it is the end of a terrace of three, not a terrace of five houses as stated in the application. The extension will be visible from the surrounding streets (Chetwynd Road in particular). It is not the case that “most of the surrounding properties have been substantially altered”. I can see no 6.5 meter extensions, despite the fact the access statement suggests there are some; and it is simply not the case that most properties have been “substantially altered” with two storey rear extensions.</p> <p><b>THE NATURE OF THE PROPOSAL</b></p> <p>Were the proposal to go ahead in the spirit proposed, it would be out of character with the architecture of the area. This includes the construction of two stories on a terraced house which had no original extension. It includes the use of opaque glass, whose visual impact is out of keeping with the area.</p> <p>The effect of the two stories will be to block light, both from the main and from skylight window of our house, and to create light pollution at night.</p> <p>It creates a potential precedent for the area, as neighbours seek to leapfrog one another to extend their homes and so to reap economic advantage. As the central property in a terrace of three, if such permissions were given on both sides, we would be looking out from the back of our house through a tunnel. Were this proposal to be allowed and be repeated it would surely lead to significant over-development</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
-----------------	------------------	------------------	-----------	----------	-----------

## OTHER COMMENTS

We note that the applicants say "The existing first floor balcony on number 23 [our dwelling], which extends a further 1.3M from the proposal at number 25A as existing takes away all privacy from the garden and allows overlooking back into number 25A .The proposed opaque glazed boundary wall set back from the party wall line is an attempt to redress this balance". We would note however that if this is a problem, it has existed for 17 years, long before the present occupants purchased number 25A, and that depending on the nature of the opaque glass, the proposed extension will have a similar effect on neighbours in "taking away all privacy".

Finally, we note that it would be possible for the applicants to apply for a single story extension, which would provide at least a half, and perhaps more of the extra space they envisage.

---