



Dear Mr. N Young,

RE: OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION REF. 2020/0293/P at Flat 1, 123 Goldhurst Terrace, London

I live at 121 Goldhurst Terrace and am writing in objection to the abovementioned planning application, for the enlargement of the existing basement; installation of a front lightwell; erection of a single storey extension and associated alternations to the rear elevation; erection of bin store and trellis fence in the forecourt, at my adjoining neighbours, at Flat 1, 123 Goldhurst Terrace, London.

I have now reviewed the proposed plans and documents and have the following concerns to the proposals:

- I am disappointed that my neighbour hasn't consulted with me regarding such a substantial proposal.

- This eastern side of Goldhurst Terrace, esp. this row of 5 terraces, all comprise a consistent design comprising the main two storey dwelling with part two and part single storey rear extensions that do not occupy the full width of the garden but maintain a c.2.3m gap between these extensions and common boundaries. This proposal would change the character and appearance of this terrace row, at a detriment to the Conservation Area. Upon review of the wider Goldhurst Terrace, there are very few examples of the proposed relationship created by these proposals where a full width rear extension flanks a northern positioned side amenity space. This is therefore an incongruous development form to the wider terrace row and approving this

application would set a detrimental precedent to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, along with the amenity of those lower floor residences.

- This terrace row has an east/west orientation, with the aforementioned 2.3m wide amenity space ensuring that my neighbours ground floor flat receives as much natural daylight/sunlight. The proposals seek to infill this external space at no. 123, with a side extension that is effectively 10m long along our common boundary. In so doing, would cause a loss of amenity through significant overshadowing to my neighbours garden and this flanking part of their flat, removing what limited daylight/sunlight they receive. I can see a break has been proposed to provide a lightwell to the basement, however this will have little benefit to their flat, resulting in an overbearing and oppressive extension.

- I note the DAS refers to pre-application notes not having an impact on 'neighbouring properties', but I don't see this analysis carried out in any of the reports. In particular, the sunlight/daylight report submitted with the application has not considered the impact on my neighbour's property.

- Continuing the discussion above, other than the Location and Block Plans, none of the drawings show the relationship of these proposals with our property, so I can fully consider the impacts. None of the elevations show 121 Goldhurst Terrace and how it would relate to this side extension and nor are there any north-south sections, esp. where it relates to the lightwell.

- Upon review of Policy A5: Basements, I have the following observations:

- o I am unconvinced that the Construction Method Statement has fully considered the 'impacts of my property', as per sub-parts (a) and (n). I did not read anything about mitigation protocol other than to state 'appropriate mitigation measures'. What could these be if there is damage to my property?

- o I would argue that the proposals fail in respect of sub-part (i), in that this must relate to the main building and not rear projections and that 'the basement is greater than 1.5 times the host building'.

- o It fails in respect of (l) whereby the basement is 'not setback from the neighbouring property boundaries where it extends beyond the footprint of the host building'. In this case, this would be the main rear elevation of my house (given the side amenity space) and the applicant is proposing a 6.5m rear basement extension with no setback from our common boundary.

- The proposals will see the removal of the herbaceous border, failing to comply with sub-part (q) and will affect our amenity as outlined above.

- Also, as a matter of protection of my amenity, I would welcome the use of a planning condition to restrict the hours of operations, the use of vibration methods of construction, dust suppression and noise limitations, etc.

To conclude, I am disappointed that so little information has been provided placing these proposals in the context of no. 121 and that of my neighbours at no. 125. We are all going to be affected by the proposals (in different ways) and feel that an omission of this information needs to be corrected and I respectfully request that the application provide me with the drawing and document details requested above, as to enable me to understand these proposals in full.

Should they fail to do so, I hold my objection and respectfully request that Officers refuse this planning application. I have cc'd in my local Councillor, Councillor Nayra Bello O'Shanahan and will be speaking with her should any such inaction take place, and I ask that should this application be presented to the planning committee for determination, that I be notified so that I can have the opportunity to speak.

Please confirm receipt of this objection and I look forward to hearing from you regarding next steps.

Kindest Regards

Isabelle Nussbaum