
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 May 2017 16:55
To: Meynell, Charlotte
Subject: Planning application 2017/2399/P 81 Clarence Way

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: Red Category

Dear Charlotte Meynell,

I'm writing this to give you some background ahead of our site meeting.

I bought and moved into my property, 83 Clarence Way, in 2011. It was in serious need of refurbishment which was carried out in 2012.

My main objective in my design was to maximise light, sun, and a view of the sky and trees. I also wanted to be mindful of the surrounding buildings, and to maintain the integrity of the property in a Conservation area. I rebuilt within the original footprint.

When in 2016, my previous neighbours at 81 Clarence Way, asked if I had any objections to a planning request to extend their bathroom on the first floor, I was bitterly disappointed. Their proposed plan would seriously compromise my morning sun and light. However, I decided not to make an objection to their plan as I felt it would not be a neighbourly gesture. Subsequently they put their property on the market, and it was sold to the applicant.

The new owners now have the benefit of an approved plan to extend on the first floor, and are also asking for permission to extend into their garden. If they were to be granted this further permission, the combination of these two factors will destroy my light, sun and view at the rear of my property.

I understand that an application (some time ago) to build out into the garden of 68 Clarence Way was rejected. The grounds were overdevelopment in a Conservation Area.

My formal objections are set out below.

I OBJECT TO THIS APPLICATION ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS.

Daylight and Sunlight

The applicant's design and access statement asserts that the daylight and sunlight to my property will not be affected, but the submitted plan and elevation appear to show that the proposed height and depth of the rear extension would mean that it fails the BRE Daylight and Sunlight rule of thumb (45 degree rule) both on plan and on section. Meaning that my daylight and sunlight would be unacceptably compromised. This would be contrary to Camden policy. Furthermore my dining room window is not plotted on the submitted plans, although this is required in order for the applicant to be able to assert that the daylight and sunlight to my property will not be affected. Given that there is such a close relationship between my dining room and the proposed extension, a BRE compliant Daylight and Sunlight report should be produced to prove that my daylight and sunlight will not be unacceptably compromised.

Overbearing nature

The side elevation of the extension will be visible above the boundary fence by some 1.3m in height, and for a length of 1.35m. Given the very close relationship of the proposed extension, and my dining room window, this will have a very overbearing impact. Furthermore, the design of the side of the extension is to be clad in black timber adding to the overbearing and heavy visual impact of the design.

Overdevelopment

Coupled with the already approved first floor extension, I believe this application represents overdevelopment of what is a small terraced house in a Conservation Area.

Kind Regards,

Bee Thompson
83 Clarence Way
NW1 8DG

