

From: Paul Gibbs [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 September 2019 08:36
To: Planning [REDACTED]
Subject: URGENT 2019/2128/P - Objection - FAO Joshua Ogunleye

FAO Joshua Ogunleye
RE 15C West Heath Road, NW3 7UU
APP 2019/2128/P

Good Morning Joshua,

I note that revised drawings have been received for planning application 2019/2128/P.
I wish to make comments regarding the updated drawings & application on behalf of my client, Mr R Makin, the owner of [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

- Updated comments following submission of revised drawings 14-024-03H sheets 1-3, received by planning dept 29.08.19.
- The property at 15B has a window immediately adjacent to the proposed existing extension at 15C. As a feature of the original design of the main building there is a large, 1m deep eaves overhang to the rear roof over the existing window. At lower ground floor there is an existing infill conservatory extension with a glazed roof.
- The proposed development at 15C, located perpendicular to the west of 15B therefore has the potential to negatively impact the existing levels of daylight & sunlight on the neighbouring property at 15B, resulting in loss of light and significant overshadowing.
- The layout of the existing extension at 15C (2015/0562/P granted 17.03.15) was amended during consultation and arranged to step in at an angle to protect the light and outlook amenity to the rear window of Flat 15B.
- While planning approved drawings for 2015/0562/P indicate approval for a 'contemporary glass roof extension by specialist', instead a flat roof with roof window has been constructed.
- The proposed extension at 15C, on the basis of revised drawings, would create a tunnel effect limiting outlook, sunlight, daylight and creating overshadowing. This is contrary to LBC Local Plan Policy A1.
- The proposed extension at 15C does not comply with LBC CPG: Altering and extending your Home 1 (notably 3.1f).
- The proposed extension does not comply with LBC CPG: Amenity (3) and breaches the 45 degree rule. The proposed extension would create an obstruction greater than 65 degrees.
- BRE guidance 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight – A Guide to Good Practice' on the effect of adjacent extensions states that:
 - Obstructions between 45 and 65 – adequate daylight would not be provided (unless very large windows are used)
 - Obstructions greater than 65 – it is often impossible to provide reasonable daylight, even if the whole wall is glazed.
- The proposed extension has not followed the screening procedure indicated in LBC CPG: Amenity (3.10-3.12, Fig 1), which is applicable to both minor and major developments (3.4-3.6). A daylight and sunlight assessment would be required.

- The property at 15B has obtained and benefits from a legal right to light on the basis of having enjoyed the light uninterrupted for 20 years. Obstruction of the passage of light may cause nuisance.

I would be grateful if you could please call me to discuss this application as a matter of urgency.

Regards,

Paul Gibbs
Architect
BA(Hons) BArch ADPPA

