

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------|--|
| 2021/2456/P | philip matthewman | 14/07/2021 11:20:47 | OBJ | Re: Planning Application 2021/2456P 80 Burghley Road NW5 1UN |

OBJECTION

We write as the owners of 82 Burghley Road , where my wife and I have lived for 35 years . Ours is the property most affected by this proposed development , which involves the removal of the existing 4 foot high garden wall between our narrow patios, and replacement with a 9 foot (2.8metres) high wall, forming the side of their proposed extension. I attach two photos with a white line drawn at 2.8metres, to show the enormity of this height. I attach also, an artists impression of what it will look like from our side of the wall. The post and string show the height and extent of the proposed extension.

We accept that a new neighbour will wish to alter and improve their property . However, this proposal will result in permanent loss of light to our garden patio, where we cultivate our plants, and entertain. This approach to our garden will resemble a prison yard , and the amenity value lost .

But even worse than that, the high wall will cause a catastrophic loss of light to our basement kitchen , and to our office / utility room, removing almost all direct light, and making them dark . Even the outlook from the raised ground floor living room will be severely affected, since it will no longer look out over the gardens, but merely onto our neighbours' new roof.

There is no light impact assessment accompanying this proposal, which, we believe , may infringe current guidelines on rights to light. The application doesn't recognise the fact that we have a lower ground floor office window. As can be seen from the photographs, the walls of the patio are painted white , to maximize the existing light.

The size and overbearing nature of this construction will more or less oblige us to construct a similar matching extension, or suffer the adverse consequences of not doing so. Thus, these developments move like a cascade along the terrace. Indeed, the application itself illustrates this cascade, by showing precedents at number 78, and at 76 . They also mention numbers 70 and 68 in support of their application. However, all is not what it seems in the application – since 78 and 76 have patios adjoining – and so bulky high square extensions are more or less matching, and therefore don't intrude on each other . Number 70 has a less imposing, sloping extension, and number 68 is much more modest altogether.

My wife and I, being pensioners, do not wish to embark on building a matching extension, since we enjoy our garden as it is , and our existing kitchen , at 30 feet long (as is the applicants) is more than ample for our needs. However, we would feel under considerable pressure build to match, as will any owner subsequent to ourselves , were it to go ahead in its current form. We do not feel we will ever get used to the loss of amenity we will suffer if this build goes ahead.

Many other Victorian properties in the area have already done back infill extensions , but most of them have a roof which slopes up from the existing garden wall, thus minimizing the impact the immediate neighbour. These tall, thin houses, 4 or 5 stories high, were designed with low garden walls for a good reason, which was to allow sufficient light into their basements to make them acceptable as habitable rooms.

In granting permission for such extensions, planners will need to give due consideration to the impact on immediate neighbours. The fact that the houses are tall should not imply that such extensions can be tall also.

We have asked our neighbours to modify their proposals, which were submitted without any prior discussion

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------|--|
| | | | | <p>with us. This can easily be done by sloping the roof down to the garden wall, (as per number 70 Burghley Rd) and by keeping the extension at the same level as their existing basement kitchen, rather than having two steps up to it, (thus raising its finished height.) (see for example, the applicants' attached drawings of 76 Burghley Rd)</p> <p>Our new neighbours have not yet replied to our request.</p> <p>In summary –</p> <p>The proposed extension is overbearing in size and shape. Loss of amenity value of important part of our garden Catastrophic loss of light to our basement kitchen and office. No light impact assessment has been done. Reduction in garden space for future generations Removal of a mature apple tree "Pink Lady" (NOT a crab-apple as stated in application) Cascade effect of this type of development- do likewise or be overshadowed. Precedents illustrated in the application are misleading.</p> <p>We hope the Planners will reject this application in its current form, or require the Applicant to make substantial modifications to their proposal.</p> <p>Philip Matthewman Andrea Beetison 82 Burghley Road 6th July 2021</p> |
| 2021/2456/P | Jo and Julian Szego | 14/07/2021 11:06:16 | OBJ | <p>We live at 85 Burghley Road. This is across the road from the planned works.</p> <p>The planned scheme would clearly block the light into the rear of 82 Burghley Road, both into the kitchen area and the rear extension. This is likely to lead to considerable loss of amenity and wellbeing. It seems to us that a reasonable compromise could be reached that allows some extension of the property at number 80 without blocking out the light at number 82 - in line with other works in the street.</p> <p>Our house has a similar aspect where the space outside our neighbours to the South could be extended in such a fashion. We would have grave objections if such a scheme were planned next door to us. In addition, we fear the proliferation of such schemes as people try to make up for the amenity they have lost through the destruction of the character and nature of these houses.</p> |