Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/2887/P	Errol Damelin	10 North End NW3 7HL	20/06/2017 00:15:33	OBJ	Dear Mr Hope,

Application Number: 2017/2887/P

The application fundamentally and meaningfully disturbs and adversely affects the residential amenity of our home by means of over-shadowing and cutting out the sunlight to our babyis bedroom.

Furthermore, the architectis drawings submitted by the applicant are false and misleading for several reasons. One of the misleading features of the drawings is that they omit showing our large bedroom window at the side of our house that will be directly blocked by the proposed extension.

[redacted] The enjoyment of sunlight during the daytime is critical for the utility of the room. Being a north-facing room, with permanent and unmovable slats covering the north-facing window, the large east-facing window that would be blocked by these proposed works was a fundamental element of the original design of the room and we have confirmed that with the architect. Over-shadowing this window, as these works would do would reduce substantially the light available to this room and therefore adversely affect our residential amenity.

The application adversely affects the residential amenity of our home for the following material reasons:

1. Would block the only source of sunlight to bedroom:
It would block the window that provides the only daylight and sunlight to the bedroom. This [redacted]

2. Would block the only window in the house that points East:
The architect who designed the house confirms that the side East-facing window, which faces East, was crucial to the utility of the house. The sunlight from the window which faces East provides the room with its only source of sunlight. The window was crucial to the structural design of the house. Without that sunlight coming through the East-facing window the room will no longer be able to be utilised as a bedroom or a playroom. The sun does not enter the North-facing window. This bedroom was only built because of this East-Facing window. The

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

architect who designed the house confirms that the rectangular East-facing widow was integral to the design of the house.

In winter months this bedroom receives no sunlight at all from the North and relies entirely for morning sun from this Easterly window, which it gets until noon. In summer months the Northerly window would only have weak sun after 6pm onwards whereas the Easterly window provides sunlight from 5am until noon when the room is principally utilised.

It is the only source of natural light to the bedroom and therefore the only reason it was possible to make the room into a bedroom. The architect confirms that the extension would severely harm the utility of the room as a bedroom. [redacted] It was quite purposeful to place the East-facing window towards the front of the house on the second floor because the house structure at number 12 North End was always meaningfully recessed. The intended architectural changes related to this planning application include filling in this space above the garage which would materially block the light to the room and thereby seriously affect the rooms utility.

3. Proximity to our home & Loss of Privacy.
The proposed extension would also bring the neighbour's house so close to our house that it will cut out the little sense of space between the two houses. It would make the homes seem almost attached wall-to-wall. It would be overshadowing our bedroom window.

The drawings submitted by the application are misleading as they do not accurately show how close the proposed extension would bring their home to our home. Loss of view reduces the amenity of the bedroom. We enjoy the natural light of the room and this would be adversely affected.

4 [redacted] and we are very concerned that there may be health and safety issues with the building. Number 12 North End is an old house, and we have not seen that any asbestos tests and health and safety tests that any building work will not be harming to our young child and other children. Homes of this age often contain Artex and have asbestos in ceilings, boiler pipes, floor tiles, gutters and panel ceilings – all of which would be disturbed by the proposed works. At a minimum, we would like to have sight of sampling test results at the property.

Also, the noise and the vibrations and the inevitable amount of dust and fumes that would be emitted onto our property and the air going into the babyis room with the building work will be severely dangerous and harmful to our four-month-old baby. [redacted] We simply cannot take any risk with childrenis health and safety issues. We hope you

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

understand.

5. Flaws in the architects drawings:
i.The architect drawings submitted by the applicant omits to show the existence of our bedroom window.
ii. The proximity is not shown accurately. The drawings submitted are skewed to give a perception of more space between the houses and conveniently disguises the overshadowing issue.

We ask you to kindly consider these adverse impacts on the utility of our home when assessing the application.

We ask further that you please reject any extension to the physical space included in the planning application, including above the garage and bordering on 10 North End.

We would welcome you visiting our property to view the potential impact.

Kind regards,

Errol Damelin and Daphna Preiskel