

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/2374/P	Julia Godzinskaya	08/08/2022 16:03:38	OBJ	Julia Godzinskaya & Edzard van der Wyck 3 Leverton Place Kentish Town London NWS 2PL 8 August 2022 For the attention of Sofie Fieldsend Reference Application Number 2022/2374/P Planning Application for 300 Kentish Town Road

Dear Mrs Fieldsend,

As the home owners of 3 Leverton Place, we are writing to object to the Planning Application for 300 Kentish Town Road for the reasons outlined below:

1. [REDACTED] at 3 Leverton Place

From the proposed plans, the distance between our main living spaces on the 1st floor (kitchen) and 2nd floor (living room) of our home at 3 Leverton Place and the new proposed bedroom windows at 300 Kentish Town Road is substantially less than the guidance and good practice recommendation of 18-22m between habitable rooms. The exact distance has been conveniently omitted from the proposed plans as it is just half of the proposed minimum distance of 18m which is simply unacceptable. The application also does not address this obvious [REDACTED] and those of our neighbours at 1 and 2 Leverton Place. The current distance between our house and the flat at 300 Kentish Town Road is already compromising our [REDACTED] and theirs: we have a direct [REDACTED] into the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] of 300 Kentish Town Road, and conversely, they have a front row seat view straight into our main living area on the 1st floor where our kitchen and dining area is. This is where we spend most of our time as a family with our children, and our [REDACTED] is already hugely compromised by the current structure and terrace access at 300 Kentish Town Road.

2. Loss of Daylight / Sunlight at 3 Leverton Place

The proposed development will cause injury to the opposing properties in the form of a loss of Daylight / Sunlight. The Daylight / Sunlight Report submitted as part of the planning application is misleading for the following reasons:

- The report claims the following in relation to the property at 1 Leverton Place: 'While there are two windows on the ground floor which will not meet for APSH across the winter months, as the room is a bedroom it is considered less sensitive to alterations in sunlight.' The ground floor room at 1 Leverton Place is NOT a bedroom but a living space so it will indeed be impacted by reductions in Sunlight.
- The report claims the following in relation to the property at 2 Leverton Place: 'The window on the ground floor, overlooking the site, will retain 79% of its existing level of VSC, retaining 15% VSC in absolute terms. This room is dual aspect with a second, unimpacted window which faces away from the site.' This is misleading as there is no other window at the back of the house (the entire ground floor backs onto a walled playground). The report continues: 'While there are reductions in daylight to this property of more than 20%, the impacts are considered to be minor adverse and not significant.' The house is sandwiched between No. 1 and No. 3 Leverton Place so the sole source of daylight into the only living / dining / kitchen area is provided by

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

the front ground floor window facing the proposed new development. It is therefore simply inaccurate to conclude that the ground floor living room retaining just 13% APSh during the winter months, below the 5% target value, in [their] opinion... will still be contextually well sunlit overall with the proposed scheme in place.)
c) The report claims the following in relation to our property at 3 Leverton Place: 'The ground floor 'will retain 2% APSh across the winter months as compared to the 5% target value with the proposed scheme in place.' This is a reduction of more than 50% and is simply not acceptable for a family home and habitable rooms. Like No 2 Leverton Place, our ground floor has no other windows apart from the one at the front of the house facing the new development. To claim that the 'impact of the proposed scheme on the daylight to this property will not be noticeable' is simply false and misleading.
d) The complete omission from the report of the impact on the property at 3 Leverton Street which backs onto the proposed development and shares a party wall.
To conclude, we strongly disagree and think it is not appropriate for Camden's Planning Solutions Team to 'apply a flexible approach in considering the sunlight impact' as suggested by the Report when 1 out of 3 south facing windows does not satisfy the BRE reduction criteria with measures that are far below the recommended minimums, and when the property with the closest proximity (3 Leverton Street) has been completely omitted from the report.

3. Size, Mass, Density of the Proposed Development
Leverton Place is a picturesque, cobbled lane, located in a conservation area, surrounded by listed buildings, and deemed the 'Notting Hill of North London' for its distinctive historic character. The proposed scale, mass and density of this new development is inappropriate and not in keeping with the aesthetic of the area and surrounding structures, particularly as it is noticeably taller than all of the surrounding homes, including our house at 3 Leverton Place.

We urge the council to object to this planning application on the ground laid out above.

Kindest regards,

Julia Godzinskaya & Edzard van der Wyck
3 Leverton Place
London NW5 2PL
