

ESTATE HOLDINGS LIMITED

18 April 2019

Registered Office and Administrative Address:

Bordage House
Le Bordage
St Peter Port
Guernsey
GY1 1BU

Telephone: [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]

For the attention of
Laura Hazelton, Planning Officer
Camden Council Planning Solutions Team
5 Pancras Square
London
N1C 4AG

Dear Ms Hazelton

REF: Proposed development –“5 & 6 Rosslyn Park Mews NW3 5 NJ” Application No 2019/0275/P

As owners of the basement Flat 1, 13 Lyndhurst Road, NW3 5NL, we are writing to strongly object to the proposed development at the rear of our property.

The existing three storey rear boundary wall as measured from the rear patio paving level, is a large brick wall dominating the whole of the rear of 12 & 13 Lyndhurst Road which is currently quite oppressive. However, the planning application looks to redevelop and extend said wall a full storey higher than it is now.

As owners of the basement Flat 1, 13 Lyndhurst Road, we are very much concerned with this proposed development and the potential it has to impede further and restrict what little daylight and sunlight our flat currently receives and in particular the rear garden patio and the rooms facing the brick wall as it now stands.

The consultancy firm, hired by the developers applying for planning permission, concluded favourably towards said developers, **despite** stating several times that several flats in both 12 and 13 Lyndhurst Road would be affected beyond the Building Research Establishment guide (BRE). In essence, some of the other apartments on other floors will also have 30% less sunlight and daylight than as it currently stands.

From research, it is our understanding the '45 degree rule', which may be used to assess planning applications for developments impacting on windows, is not being used to evaluate the **rights to light**. In addition, the '50:50 rule' however, which may also be deemed adequate guide, involves determining what percentage of a room receives sufficient light on a working plane 850 mm above the floor. Even in this case an injury would be considered to have occurred where the percentage is reduced to less than 50%. It is our contention therefore that the proposed extra wall height would be a breach of the 'rights to light'.

We strongly urge you to refuse planning permission for this development

Yours Sincerely
For and on behalf of Estate Holdings Limited

[REDACTED]
Fort Limited, Corporate Director

[REDACTED]
Sadie Harris
Elton Limited, Corporate Director