

[REDACTED]

From: Bob House [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 September 2017 16:30
To: Planning
Subject: Re planning application 2017/4342/P, 57 Falkland Road

Dear Mr Marfleet

With reference to planning application 2017/4342/P, 57 Falkland Road, I would like to add some supplementary comments to the ones I submitted on 30th August 2017. I have referenced my points to relevant sections of the

Camden Planning Department policy document on Amenity as published on your website.

Section 6: Daylight and sunlight

This section states that daylight and sunlight reports will be required where there is potential to reduce existing levels of daylight and sunlight. We have asked the applicant if any such reports exist: he has said that he is not aware of any. Based on the drawings in the application, and the principle of projecting a 25 degree line from the centre of the lowest window in our house, we do not consider that the whole of the proposed development is lower than this line, so it may have a substantial effect on the daylight that we currently enjoy.

Section 7: Privacy and Outlook

Section 7.4 states that new developments should be designed to protect the privacy of both new and existing dwellings to a reasonable degree and mentions that one of the most sensitive areas to overlooking is the part of a garden nearest to the house. We believe that the first floor end window in the proposed extension will overlook our garden near the house.

Section 7.5 states that outlook is the visual amenity enjoyed by occupants when looking out of their windows or from their garden, and that how pleasant an outlook is depends on what is being viewed. New developments should be designed so that the occupiers have a pleasant outlook. Currently, from our conservatory and first floor bathroom window, we have an unimpeded outlook over gardens and trees to the street behind our house. The proposed development would block a substantial part of this outlook with a blank brick wall. We consider that this would impair our outlook in a significant way.

For these reasons, we maintain our objection to the current proposals on grounds of loss of residential amenity (privacy, light and outlook) and repeat our request that the proposed extension is reduced to a single storey which would match the height of our own rear extension - and to which we would have no objection.

Yours sincerely

**Robert
House**

