| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|-------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|--|
| 2021/2456/P | philip matthewman | 10/09/2021 10:21:37 | OBJ | Philip Matthewman and Andrea Beetison - Immediate neighbour 82 Burghley Rd NW5 1UN |
| | | | | Re: Planning Application 2021/2456P 80 Burghley Road NW5 1UN |
| | | | | 10th Sept 2021 |
| | | | | REVISED APPLICATION - OBJECTION |
| | | | | Dear Ewan Campbell, Planner, |
| | | | | As you rightly say, the revised plans have reduced the height and depth of the original design. Whilst giving us encouragement that our new neighbours have shown an ability to compromise, the revisions are insufficient to make any material difference. The height has come down from half a metre above our office window, to level with the top of it, and 70cm above our patio doors (see arrow on photo) |
| | | | | All our objections , already submitted 15/7 and with photos 20/7, still stand . |
| | | | | The principal objection is with the increase in height of the garden wall, where it adjoins the house, from 1.4m existing, to 2.35m PLUS the additional height of the sloping skylight. This is still an increase of virtually 1 metre over existing garden wall height, and the adverse effect on our patio and light to our basement rooms remains. I am puzzled as to why, the generally accepted 2 metre height restriction on garden walls and fences, is not thought to apply to the garden wall close to the house. In our case, it is the most critical part of the garden wall, and our patio an important amenity well worth defending. |
| | | | | There has still been no light impact survey on the revised proposal. |
| | | | | RIGHTS TO LIGHT The window apertures of our property have ben unchanged for the past 20 years, indeed since construction in 1880, and so have long-established "Rights to Light. Where the existing light is already inadequate, the BRE guidelines are no longer seen as the final arbiter, and ANY further loss of light may be considered a detriment, though I accept this is may be a legal matter rather than a planning concern. |
| | | | | PJM 82 Burghley Road – (Immediate neighbour) |
| | | | | PS Should the matter go to Committee, I would appreciate the opportunity to speak, and would be grateful if this could scheduled for after 4th October, since I shall be busy the week before. |

Printed on: 13/09/2021

09:10:08