

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/5709/P	Vincent Wong, Jennifer Lo & Jasmine Wong	20/12/2019 13:33:30	OBJ	<p>1. Introduction</p> <p>a. This detailed objection letter explains why the application at 521 Finchley Road, as it currently stands, should be refused by the Council. There are 5 fundamental points of objection that the owners of No. 1G Parsifal Road wish to present:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ¿ Impacts on daylight, sunlight and outlook ¿ Privacy ¿ Building mass and height ¿ Vehicle Access and Highway safety ¿ Impact of the Basement and Construction Phase <p>b. The proposal includes a 2 storey plus basement level new build directly adjacent to the property boundary within less than 1.5m of the existing neighbouring house. Therefore it is far from an acceptable proposal in terms of its impacts, especially on the neighbouring property.</p> <p>2. Impacts on Daylight, sunlight and outlook</p> <p>a. Parsifal House (521 Finchley Road) is a building comprising of 14 flats with 12 garages to the rear of the property. The proposal is to demolish the rear garages and erect a 2 storey building plus basement level adjacent to the existing boundary with sunken gardens and 5 new garages.</p> <p>b. Mr Wong and his family are concerned that, due to the proposed placement of the new building, the proposal will greatly affect available sunlight to their property on the NW elevation where the development will be directly opposite. The 2 storey extension would potentially overlook and greatly affect the amount of natural light to their roof garden and will deprive 1G of natural light to the bedroom, bathroom and the single stair circulation space.</p> <p>c. The effect on the light into the stairwell, though not a habitable space, will cause a potential safety issue by limiting visibility to the only circulation space to the first floor. The objectors will require additional lighting in this space to mitigate the significant reduction of light.</p> <p>d. The drawings, particularly the plans and elevations, appear to show inaccuracies in regard to the distance between 1G and the boundary line, illustrating a larger gap between the development and 1G, seen in the figure above. The drawings are also missing window locations on 1G, though clearly indicated within other neighbouring properties. Given the proposals proximity to 1G Parsifal this is surely and unacceptable oversight within the drawings.</p> <p>e. Accurate data or plans were not requested from the occupants at 1G. Indicative if not accurate floor plans for this property could have been obtained from a planning search of Camden Council as drawings were submitted in an application by the occupants of 1G, an application that was listed in the Design and Access Statement's planning history.</p> <p>f. The Design and Access Statement refers to a daylight/sunlight study which concluded that 'there is compliance with the BRE Guidelines in terms of daylight and sunlight and the neighbouring properties' however this study does not appear to have evidence of substantial consideration to the impacts in the areas enjoyed by the occupants of 1G.</p> <p>g. The figures relied upon within the study appear to be estimated and not definitive as</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

locations of rooms and windows within 1G are not accurately indicated within the model or the submitted drawings.

h. Although it is noted in the submitted daylight/sunlight study that the VSC (Vertical Sky Component) for the windows are within the BRE guidelines of >27% it is also known that this target value is derived from a low density suburban housing model, which this particular area is not.

i. It appears that the proposal does not recognise the importance of daylighting to the occupants of 1G particularly given it unnecessarily overshadows the roof garden and affects 3 windows on the side elevation and 3 windows and 2 bifold doors on the rear elevation.

3. Privacy

a. The privacy at 1G Parsifal will be affected by the proposed two- storey building due to its very close proximity to the property and boundary edge.

b. The objectors are concerned about overlooking from the rear of the proposed building into 1G Parsifal's roof garden which the objectors often use for entertaining and leisure.

c. The drawings submitted with this proposal do not confirm that the proposed windows to the rear are within the 45% overlooking boundary of the roof garden adjacent.

4. Bulk, Scale & Massing

a. The proposed building is a two storey new build which appears to take its massing cues from the size of 1G Parsifal, however it extends approx. 2.8m beyond 1G Parsifal's habitable space and blocks views and light to the habitable spaces and roof garden.

b. 1G Parsifal currently has an approx. 1.1m wide alley way, which was measured on site by GPA Chartered Town Planners, used for access to the garden from the front of the property and store for bins. The proposal is intended to be built directly on the boundary line which only accentuates its size on the neighbouring property by effectively limiting natural sunlight and creating a dark, tunnel-like space in the area.

c. It should be considered that the drawings illustrate a much larger gap between 1G and the boundary, showing a 1.6m gap instead of its more accurate 1.1m. This is an unacceptable inaccuracy in the drawings that appears to mitigate the impact of the development on the occupants of 1G.

d. It should also be considered that its proximity to the boundary line leaves less than 1.2m between a solid wall and 1G Parsifal Road. This is surely not enough distance between two detached houses, and will result in a cramped and overbearing on the street scene.

e. The Design and Access Statement did note that the design of the building does take care in limiting windows on the elevation closest to the boundaries however does not take into account that this results in a long solid brickface wall which significantly reduces the quality of outlook experienced at 1G Parsifal.

f. The Council is requested to review this proposal keeping in mind there is no gap given between the boundary line and the 2 storey development and though not specifically noted in the Camden SPD for Design, should still be considered unacceptable.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

5. Vehicle Access and Highway Safety

- a. The application form indicates the existing parking will be reduced from 12 garages to 5 garages to the rear of the proposed property. 7 of the existing garages will be replaced with front gardens and lightwells for the proposed houses.
- b. It is a concern of the occupants of 1G that there appears to be no justification for the removal of 7 garages, currently in use by the residents of 521 Finchley and understood to be required by the planning approval on that building (see approval ref. F4/5/B/2006). The removal of these parking spaces will negatively impact the area by significantly increasing parking stress on the roads and surrounding area.
- c. Additionally there does not appear to be any consideration to the proposed access which critically depends on the use of a portion of the land belonging to 1E/1F (area A in the above). This area is not within the application red line and appears to not be within the control of the applicant.
- d. The objectors have also indicated that the space in front of the existing garages is often used to facilitate multi - point turns by resident's vehicles and visiting vehicles such as delivery lorries, visitors etc. If this were to become unusable it would be a significant inconvenience for not only the objectors but the other neighbouring properties as well.
- e. The objectors are also concerned about parking for the existing parking at 1E and 1F in regard to the new access proposed. The proposed front amenity space extends approx. 4m into the existing forecourt, significantly limiting maneuver space for the vehicles of 1E and 1F and potentially affects visibility for pedestrians entering the private street.

6. Impacts of Basement and Construction Phase

- a. The proposed basement is very deep and the Council are requested to review the impacts of construction on 1G. The owner has concerns regarding the permanent impacts of the basement construction, eg. impact on water table, structure etc.
- b. The owners of 1G are also concerned about how the construction phase will affect parking and vehicle mobility for the neighbouring properties, particularly during the excavation period.
- c. The Council is also requested to consider the objectors concerns of wall and basement construction within 1.2m of their property. Particularly with issues pertaining to the structural concerns of the excavation works of the substantial basement, the placement of temporary structures (scaffolding) and potential of projectiles from height into their alleyway and/or windows.
- d. The objectors are also concerned that the level of detail provided within the submitted Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) is minimal and not fully considered as the drawings provided do not show 1G with accuracy. There seems no evidence of a geotechnical investigation. This is surely unacceptable as 1G Parsifal will stand to be significantly affected if the proper consideration is overlooked.
- e. Given the time allocated for neighbour objections, the occupants of 1G Parsifal would kindly request more time to fully investigate the BIA with a consultant to fully understand the impact on their property or for the Council to demand further information via a geotechnical report, detailed BIA ,etc.

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

f. The Construction Management Plan submitted appears to be inadequate in addressing these issues, especially in regard to this deep basement and the close proximity of the proposed to 1G Parsifal Road.

7. Conclusion

a. This proposal is over-development. In summary, it is felt that all of the detailed objections raised in this objection letter are significant material considerations. The gravity of the adverse impacts of this proposal are significant and therefore the application should be refused.

b. The scale, bulk and massing of the proposed building is too great and the space left around the building for access renders the vehicle circulation unsafe and creates additional inconvenience for neighbours.

c. The potential effects on the existing structure at 1G Parsifal Road have not been sufficiently considered.

d. The impacts on natural daylight, sunlight and outlook, currently enjoyed by occupants at 1G are unacceptable.

e. In view of the very significant harm that would be caused by this development, the owners of 1G Parsifal Road formally request that this application be considered by the Planning Committee, (rather than at Officer level) and also that it should be refused.
