

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/5626/P	Jan Cookson	15/01/2022 12:01:51	OBJ	Application Number2021/5626/P

I am the owner of Flat 1 - the garden flat - at 21 Rosslyn Hill NW3 5UJ and wish to object to the above planning application for the following reasons:

1. Adverse impact on amenity.

As the owner of the rear garden at 21 Rosslyn Hill this development would have a serious impact on my amenity. At 6.9 metres, the new extension would run the whole length of my garden, at a height that I understand would match the existing extension. At less than one metre from the boundary, a solid brick wall over ten feet high would loom over the whole length of the garden. It would also impede light to the garden, restricting my ability to grow plants that have become a haven for bees, butterflies and aphids.

This application can be distinguished from the one in 2014 because that did not totally block out sight lines or affect light right across the back of the garden. I regret that this application would do exactly that.

It is also important to consider that Flat 1 is essentially a basement flat. This means it is at a level significantly lower than that of the proposed development. As a consequence a height of 3.4 metres has a much greater impact on amenity due to the lower level of my property

2. Increased risk of flooding.

The land slopes downward from Eldon House to 21 Rosslyn Hill.

My flat was flooded during the downpour we experienced on 12 July 2021. A great deal of rainwater came off the flat roof and poorly maintained and broken gutters on the existing extension at Eldon House. The flooding risk would be increased by this development.

3. Threat to tree.

There is an impressive Scots pine tree in the garden that could well be adversely impacted by the proposed development. The site is covered by a designated conservation area with the enhanced protection this rightly gives to trees. As the applicant's own arboriculture adviser accepts in his report,

'I concluded that most of the proposed extension would within the calculated Root Protection Area (RPA) of the pine tree. Whilst this would normally be an adverse material consideration in the planning process, implementation of this proposal might be possible if special construction methods are used.'

It is important to stress the use of the word 'might' in this expert report. Even if the detailed works described are carried out the tree will be at risk from this development. Surely in a designated conservation area this is not a risk that the planning authority would wish to take.

The risk of loss of the tree also further adds to my concern about the development increasing the risk of flooding to my property.

4. Loss of visual amenity from Rosslyn Hill.

At present there is a lovely sight line from Rosslyn Hill through my garden to the Scots pine. This would largely be lost if this application is approved.

**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Received:**    **Comment:**    **Response:**

5. Site over-development.

As mentioned earlier, this site falls within a designated conservation area. The building footprint has already been increased and this application would in my opinion represent over development of part of the designated conservation area. This is also a good example of 'creeping development' when applications are made a few years apart, because if they were made as one application it would be rejected.

Before a decision is taken could I urge the relevant planning officers to do a site visit to see at first hand the reasons why this application should be refused. Thank you for your consideration.

---