

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/0275/P	Martin Hicks and Nicola Timmerly	26/04/2019 06:56:54	COMM/EMP ER	<p>We are writing to strongly object to the above application as our right of light and amenity will be severely impacted if this development is allowed for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The application raises significant concerns as a result of harm to our outlook, daylight and privacy.</li><li>2. From a review of the daylight and sunlight analysis, provided by the applicants consultants, Rights of Light Consulting, [REDACTED] Lyndhurst Road will experience reductions in its light condition beyond that which the BRE advocates and not within an acceptable margin.</li><li>3. No daylight distribution analysis has been submitted. On this point alone the application is deficient and should not be granted. It does not properly represent the true position and is thus open to challenge.</li><li>4. The proposed development will have a substantial deleterious impact on the outlook for our basement garden flat. A large part of the visible sky will be blocked reducing the level of sunlight on the garden and thereby unfairly restricting any occupants enjoyment of this precious outdoor amenity.</li><li>5. The existing building already overshadows the back garden and the substantial increase in height will cause disproportionate loss by casting the garden into shade for longer periods than presently occur. The light that the basement flat gets at the moment is limited and this development will cause the flat to be in darkness for the most of the day. This is not acceptable and monetary compensation is not an option (should this be suggested by the developer).</li><li>6. The bulk, height and detailed design of the roof extension along with the proposed terraces would also cause harm to the character and appearance of the host buildings and wider Mews. The disproportionality of scale will create a tunnel effect between the two properties. The so called 'Artists impression' is misleading.</li></ol> <p>We trust, therefore, that members will not grant planning permission</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/0275/P	Kathleen Quint	26/04/2019 07:26:08	OBJ	26 April 2019

Dear Sirs,

I wish to express my strong objections to the works proposed in the planning application 2019 /0275/P and which align with the planning officers' pre-application comments.

- 1 The effect on the Lyndhurst Road properties of the extra floor would be overbearing; the rear windows will look out onto the blank rear wall of the mews houses which would be increased in height by 50%.
- 4 The extended mews building will become overwhelming in scale and create a canyon effect between the two blocks of buildings.
- 1 The additional height will block out a very large part of the visible sky when viewed from the rear windows of the Lyndhurst Road properties.
- 4 The existing building overshadows the back gardens to the Lyndhurst Road properties for a significant period. Adding height to the building will cause disproportionate injury by casting the back gardens into shade for a significantly longer period than at present, materially damaging the residents' outdoor amenity.
- 4 The shadows cast by the extension would extend much higher up the back elevation of the Lyndhurst Road properties, affecting more windows – the Artists interpretation misrepresents this.

I have taken advice from a firm of architects and a rights of light expert Alex Schatunowski and as a consequence feel that aspect has not been properly represented and is open to challenge.

I trust the members will understand our position and will not grant Planning Permission for these works.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Quint

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/0275/P	Martin Ticks	26/04/2019 07:00:00	OBJEMPER	<p>[REDACTED] We are writing to strongly object to the above application as our right of light and amenity will be severely impacted if this development is allowed for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The application raises significant concerns as a result of harm to our outlook, daylight and privacy.</li><li>2. From a review of the daylight and sunlight analysis, provided by the applicants consultants, Rights of Light Consulting, [REDACTED] Lyndhurst Road will experience reductions in its light condition beyond that which the BRE advocates and not within an acceptable margin.</li><li>3. No daylight distribution analysis has been submitted. On this point alone the application is deficient and should not be granted. It does not properly represent the true position and is thus open to challenge.</li><li>4. The proposed development will have a substantial deleterious impact on the outlook for our basement garden flat. A large part of the visible sky will be blocked reducing the level of sunlight on the garden and thereby unfairly restricting any occupants enjoyment of this precious outdoor amenity.</li><li>5. The existing building already overshadows the back garden and the substantial increase in height will cause disproportionate loss by casting the garden into shade for longer periods than presently occur. The light that the basement flat gets at the moment is limited and this development will cause the flat to be in darkness for the most of the day. This is not acceptable and monetary compensation is not an option (should this be suggested by the developer).</li><li>6. The bulk, height and detailed design of the roof extension along with the proposed terraces would also cause harm to the character and appearance of the host buildings and wider Mews. The disproportionality of scale will create a tunnel effect between the two properties. The so called 'Artists impression' is misleading.</li></ol> <p>We trust, therefore, that members will not grant planning permission</p>