

[REDACTED]

From: Craig, Tessa
Sent: 11 May 2017 08:30
To: Planning
Subject: FW: Planning application 31 Ferncroft avenue, London NW3 7PG

Please can this be redacted, pdf'd and uploaded

Thanks

From: Ines De La Chaise [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: 10 May 2017 17:12
To: Craig, Tessa [REDACTED]
Subject: Planning application 31 Ferncroft avenue, London NW3 7PG

Dear Ms Craig,

Further to our conversation yesterday, I would like to object to the proposed planning application number 2017/1953/P.

We live in the neighbouring property at 33 Ferncroft avenue, in the lower ground floor + ground floor garden maisonette.

We believe that the proposed design of the rear south-west extension to match No 29 - with the removal of the terrace on the 1st floor - will result in an unreasonable and significant loss of sunlight and daylight in all our rooms located at lower ground floor and ground floor on the west side of the house.

This obstruction of natural daylight and sunlight will result in a constant use of artificial light, increasing electricity bills and pollution, as can be seen on attached photos.



Ground floor room on west side



Same room as above.n.g - from this photo you can see that the existing extension is already obstructing our window



Same room as above from a different angle of - if the terrace was going to be removed at 31 Ferncroft, the reduction of daylight will be significant.



Another room on the ground floor - west side - facing a window at 31 Ferncroft that is to be removed in the proposal.



Same room as above from another angle showing that the daylight comes from above the terrace at 31 Ferncroft.



Same room as above - benefiting from sunshine



Same room as above - with the proposed extension we will not get the sunlight.



Same room as above - the sunlight makes a huge difference



Room at lower ground floor - west side - showing the contrast of darkness and brightness due to sunlight.

As shown in the above photos, the suppression of a number of windows on the south-east elevation of 31 Ferncroft, will also increase the feeling of being boxed in and will considerably reduce the reflection of the light off their white frame windows forcing us again in an increased consumption of energy.

Contrary to No 29 (and its neighbouring property No 27), our house is located at a lower level than No 31 and is also less distant. As a result, the obstruction of light caused by the extension will not be comparable.

33 Ferncroft being a listed house, the change of aesthetics with a double height contemporary narrow window on the south-east elevation will be out of character with our neighbouring property.

The other double height extremely large window on the south-west elevation will also add (with the other side window) an incredible amount of artificial light at night time, causing a loss of privacy and creating light pollution on our west side.

Considering all those factors, we feel that this proposal will have a strong negative impact on our daily life.

Best regards,

Ines de la Chaise

Sent from my iPad

Sent from my iPad