

---

**From:** daphne agerholm [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 30 January 2018 10:37  
**To:** Lester, Robert; Beales, Danny (Councillor); [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: Re Plans to extend above 68-74 Rochester Place NW1 9JX

Dear Robert and Danny,  
After further consideration, I have slightly modified my original objection to somewhat emphasise the sense of enclosure that the proposed building would be likely to cause and to object to the design. Please see below.  
I should be most grateful if this new version could be put on the website.  
Best wishes,  
Daphne

Sent from [Outlook](#)

---

---

Dear Sirs,  
This letter is intended to oppose the proposal to extend above the existing units of 68-74 Rochester Place. This building is situated just behind the garden wall of our house at 52 Rochester Rd. My opposition is as a local resident: the members of this household expect to be affected adversely by the proposed addition. It can be expected to have effects on light, to make us feel encroached upon and to be of an unsuitable design for the immediate area.

The extension, lying over the building in such proximity to our residence and small garden, would cause a decrease in both sunlight and daylight reaching our property. This seems inevitable, since the new structure will make the building much taller and will be constructed primarily of black metal.

It would tend to cause an increased feeling of being "hemmed in" in what is already a crowded environment. This sense of encroachment, or enclosure, is difficult to explain and quantify, but seems important to me. The experience of the building of a mansard roof extension opposite our house in Rochester Rd some years ago seems relevant in this regard: it had quite a profound and rather depressing effect of imposing that building into the surrounding space, almost like being imprisoned. I was surprised at the extent of this effect and was pleased when further plans to add roof extensions in the street were declined planning permission.

Our garden is already very shady and it is a constant battle to find shade-tolerant plants that will thrive. Nevertheless, the outside space, whilst small, acts as an important and delightful extension of our living space for us and our visitors, especially when the weather is clement. We have lived here since 1979 and know from experience that our quality of enjoyment can be subdued by matters affecting the building directly behind our garden wall, because it is so near. For instance, noise and pollution from an air conditioning unit on that building was very troublesome and we were very thankful that it was eventually removed. We have also previously opposed extension plans put forward by a local resident who owned

the units in Rochester Place for a while: the opposition by us and neighbours was mainly on the grounds of the light inhibition likely to be caused by his proposal, which was not carried out.

The plans that I have seen indicate that the design of the extension proposed will be quite incongruous with the present surroundings, as viewed from our house and garden. The present building is undeniably industrial in appearance, but the size and shape, as well as the materials used, seem fitting. We have always welcomed the idea that the buildings behind our house are places of work, rather than dwellings, as part of a thriving and bustling community and these small offices and workshops seem entirely in keeping.

More generally, the effect of the proposed extension would be to increase the pressures on the well-used amenities in the local area. In particular, it could be expected to add to the congestion in Rochester Place, a narrow mews that is already intensively used by residents and people staffing or visiting the small businesses there. The surface of the road was extensively refurbished over a long period of months with a new pebble surface not that long ago - yet more use of the road would add to the wear and tear of this rather lovely surface. Parking could be expected to be even more of a problem than at present and visitors to the mews would be likely to "spill over" into the nearby streets.

Rochester Place is currently put to good mixed use. I walk through it at the start of my fairly long journey to work, in preference to other routes, because it is interesting, friendly and surprisingly attractive, especially since the gardens for the (previously GLC) flats were fenced off and improved for residents use. Walking along the mews and through Reeds Place provides a very pleasant start to my day, often including an exchange or two with people getting ready to work in the offices and workshops. This modest expectation would be marred by the looming black extension of the proposal, which would not be in keeping or harmony with the surrounding buildings: whilst gradual changes can be interesting and enhancing, or at least acceptable, this proposal seems entirely unsuitable.

I very much hope that you will not approve the proposal.

Yours sincerely,  
Daphne Agerholm.

Sent from [Outlook](#)

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer.

**Disclaimer**

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation to the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived by Mimecast Ltd, an innovator in Software as a Service (SaaS) for business. Providing a **safer** and **more useful** place for your human generated data. Specializing in; Security, archiving and compliance. To find out more [Click Here](#).