



45 Welbeck Street
London W1G 8DZ
020 3409 7755
info@hghconsulting.com

hghconsulting.com

FAO Mr Adam Greenhalgh
Planning Officer
Camden Council
5 Pancras Square
London N1C 4AG

21st June 2019

LPA ref: 2019/1991/P

Dear Mr Greenhalgh,

Re: Objection to rear extension proposal at Flat 1, 226 Finchley Road, London, NW3 6DH

We write on behalf of the residents at Langland Mansions, 228 Finchley Road (Flats 1A, 1B, 2, 3, 5, 6B, 7B, 8, 9B, 10B and 11) and Langland Mansions Management Limited in response to your recommendation for approval for the above application. We have reviewed your Members Briefing Pack and would like to raise and clarify the following points which you should now take into account before making a decision.

Firstly, the amended OS plan (LN176358) submitted on the 4th June 2019 does not show the proposed extension relative to neighbouring properties, which is necessary to understand its impacts and therefore should be provided before a decision is made. Clarity should also be given on the dimensions of the proposed extension; is the extension confirmed to be 5m deep from the existing building line and 2.5m height?

Within the Members Briefing Pack you have stipulated that the proposed development would not give rise to overshadowing or daylight and sunlight issues. Although there is already a timber fence along the boundary, the proposed brick structure would be both taller (by approximately 1 metre), and of a more dominating material (brick). This is considered to result in a sense of enclosure and reduce the amount of sunlight and daylight on this side of the building.

The current side window to Flat 1B at no. 228 is a habitable room (bedroom) which currently gets direct sunlight as they have shown in photos in their previous letter of objection. The large rear window referred to in your Members Briefing Pack paragraph 1.6 does not get sufficient direct sunlight given its orientation facing a 3m high solid bunker structure and a substantial tree at no. 226 Finchley Road. Given that it is considered there will be a loss of direct sunlight into a habitable room at 1B, no. 228 Finchley Road, evidence that the proposed extension would not have an adverse effect on sunlight and daylight to neighbouring properties should be provided by the applicants as required by Local Plan Policy A1 and the local validations list. Without such information, an informed planning decision cannot be made.

The Member's Briefing Pack states that the proposed new windows would not cause a detrimental impact to the privacy of the neighbouring properties, particularly Flat 1B at no. 228. You have also stated that the proposed new windows would "*not be sited opposite habitable windows at flat 1b Langland Mansions*". No information has been provided by the applicant on the exact location of the proposed windows in relation to the side windows of no. 228, or the size of the proposed side windows. The previous application proposed a large side window of (1.2m x 1.8m) and a small side window (0.5m x 1m). Clarity should be provided on the dimensions and location of these window, for should the windows be sited opposite habitable rooms of no. 228, particularly Flat 1B at no. 228 then this would



understandably give rise to significant privacy and issues. Again, there is insufficient information to make an informed planning decision.

As we previously stated in our objection letter, although we appreciate every planning application is to be decided on its own merits, we would also ask that you consider the unfortunate precedents that would be set (as described above) if this application were to be approved.

Given that 19 objections have been submitted, and there is insufficient information to make an informed planning decision, sufficient time for a proper assessment of the proposal should be given to neighbouring properties due to the potential adverse impact to daylight and sunlight, overshadowing and privacy. We therefore request that (1) the necessary information is provided by the applicant (2) sufficient consultation time is given to review and comment on this information, and (3) the application be referred to Planning Committee for proper evaluation and assessment.

We await your formal response to this letter and acknowledgement of the above.

Yours faithfully,

Roger Hepher

Director

cc. Cllr Andrew Parkinson

cc. Cllr Henry Newman

cc. Cllr Gio Spinella