

Application No: Consultees Name: Received: Comment:

2021/4569/P Laura Rosefield 03/12/2021 16:49:39 OBJ

Printed on: 06/12/2021 09:10:04

Response:

Dear Sirs,

RE: LPA REF: 2021/4569/P - FLAT 2, 27 LYNDHURST ROAD, LONDON, NW3 5PB

[REDACTED] and I am writing to you in respect of the above application for a single storey extension and new rear/side windows at Flat 2, 27 Lyndhurst Road, NW3.

As such, and whilst I have no in principle objection to my neighbours proposal to extend their property, I do strongly object to the proposed addition of a frosted/opaque glass window to the party wall with my property (Flat 1) - as shown on Drawing (Side Elevation East - Proposed), for the following reasons:

(1) Flat 1 has recently been the subject of positive pre-application advice from Camden Council in respect of a proposed extension, which will run along the subject party wall with Flat 2. As such, the Council has formally advised that with some minor modification prior to submission, Flat 1s proposed extension would likely receive a favourable response from the Council.

It follows that the window currently proposed by Flat 2 would subsequently look directly into the bedroom created by Flat 1s proposed extension. Likewise, Flat 1 would be able to look into the proposed living area of Flat 2, which would clearly be wholly inappropriate, in both instances - quite simply, it would be perverse for there to be a window on a party wall between the two respective proposed extensions.

Furthermore, and even if the forthcoming application to extend my property (at Flat 1) was not brought forward, the proposed window to Flat 2s extension, would look over Flat 1s balcony and vice versa; opaque or otherwise, the sense of enclosure that would be created by this window, would still be wholly inappropriate.

(2) Flat 2 does not own a share of the freehold to 27 Lyndhurst Road, and according to Flat 2s lease, there is an absolute prohibition on alterations to the property. Furthermore, the freeholders have not been approached prior to Flat 2s application to the Council, and I understand that they are unlikely to grant permission for the plans in their current form, especially as the freeholders have already appropriately agreed permission in principle for Flat 1s extension.

(3) In any event, the addition of this window would not enhance Flat 2s proposed extension, or conversely, without it, the proposed extension would not be negatively affected. The plans for the proposed extension already include floor to ceiling double height bi-fold doors (across both the lower and upper floors of Flat 2 - the subject room is double height) of approximately 4.5m x 3.5m, which would cover almost the entire width of the property at the rear (and would be in the same room as the proposed side window which is the subject of this objection). It follows that as the rear of the property is south facing, the room in question would be flooded with light, and the proposed side window along the eastern elevation is wholly unnecessary.

(4) In addition to the proposed bi-fold doors, Flat 2s plans also include within the Side Elevation to the West, the addition of a suitable additional window (which does not affect a party wall or detrimentally impact a neighbouring property) of approximately 1.5m x 3.5m. Moreover, there will remain an additional double height, large, arched window within the Side Elevation to the West of the same room. As already set out above, this proposed room will subsequently have an abundance of light without the creation of an additional window

Printed on: 06/12/2021 09:10:04

Application No:      Consultees Name:      Received:

Comment:

Response:

within the party wall with Flat 1, and with the resulting restrictions on Flat 1 set out above. Again, and on this further basis, I would reiterate that the proposed side window along the eastern elevation is wholly unnecessary.

(5) Finally, I note that drawings 1037\_27LR\_D100 and 1037\_27LR\_D101 submitted in support of this application are misleading as they do not show or refer to the proposed party wall window, since the plans are drawn at the lower level. The window which forms the subject of this objection is shown only at drawings 1037\_27LR\_D103 and 1037\_27LR\_D106.

In light of the above, I would respectfully request that this application be refused unless it is appropriately amended to exclude the proposed window along the Eastern Side Elevation (within the party wall with Flat 1).

I trust that the above is self-explanatory, but should you require any further information or clarification, please do not hesitate to contact me via the details provided below.

Yours faithfully,

Laura Rosefield

---