

From:Shahida Chauhdry
Sent:7 Oct 2019 23:58:25 +0100
To:Planning Consultation
Subject:Reference: 19/4909/FUL

Dear Sir or Madam,

Site: 90 Wise Lane, London, NW7 2RD

I object to the planning application for the following reasons.

We have looked at the footprint of the proposed development, and the right to light act and there is a drawing called "Proposed degree angle" which shows a line from the building to the centre pane of my habitable windows in my property. I am worried about losing light (this is based on this drawing and is not a detailed study) therefore I would like to ask for a sun study to be carried out, a computer model of the buildings to show a shadow study of the sun at different points in the day/month time of year. This would be an accurate way of showing overshadowing.

The massing of the building in relation to my house concerns me. The design has an overbearing impact on my house.

I am concerned about the noise pollution due to excavating. I would request no weekend working. We have not seen the structural design, this will probably come later after planning, but it could be a piled foundations. This is noisy and disruptive.

I also request dust screens should be erected to prevent any demolition dust falling onto my cars and windows etc

The dressing room Juliette balcony; this part of the building is 1.5 meters forward from my building line so their view out would be to the back of my garden and the patio, as there is little trees and planting on the side of the house along the boundary throughout most of the year, except for summer time. Instead of a Juliette balcony, this should be replaced with normal windows of standard size. The master bedroom has a double height space, and tall windows. Their views out would be of their garden with views over my garden (rear and patio) regardless of the window being the centre of building elevation.

The window in the first floor ensuite overlooks our property, I notice this ensuite has a roof window as well, therefore it should be sufficient to build only a roof window and no side facing window. I notice the second ensuite on the same floor only has a roof window.

I request a reduction in the number of windows on the side of the house. The introduction of four windows on the side roof elevation along the boundary of my house and their positioning would negatively impact on my privacy and amenity.

In the very least, I request for the window to the first floor ensuite overlooking my property is opaque privacy glass (not film) and that the velux roof windows are obscure glass.

I wish my comments to remain sensitive and not for public viewing.

Kind regards,

Mrs Shahida Chaudhry

Address: 92 Wise Lane, London, NW7 2RD

Alex
Reeves

From: Alex Reeves
Sent: 21 Oct 2019 14:20:30 +0100
To: Planning Consultation
Subject: Fwd: No 90 Wise Lane 19/4909/FUL

Dear Planning Team,

Further to Mrs Chauhdry of No 92 Wise Lane NW7 2RD submitted comments (7th October) objecting to the application at No 90 Wise Lane 19/4909/FUL (Demolition of existing dwelling house. Erection of new 2no. storey dwelling house with rooms to roof space, including, off street parking, refuse and recycle store, 1no. heat pump, and associated amenities) she would like to draw your attention to several more concerns they have.

There are 3 roof windows (3No Velux in style, 2 to the ensuites on the first and 2nd floor and one for the plant room) There is one window to an ensuite on the first floor which overlook No 92 Wise Lane in the proposal. The drawings do not show or indicate any privacy glass within the submitted drawing pack, it also does not show what are openable window and doors as the dashed hinge lines are missing from the drawn elevations (see drawing P_PL_203). Currently there is a loss of private amenity to No 92, to rectify this concern, could we ask that you raise this issue with the applicant and within your report it is stipulated that the glass to all these rooflights and window on this side elevation is frosted privacy glass (not film). The windows do not need to be openable to the bathroom and ensuites on this elevation as the rooms will be mechanically extracted, for Building Regulations compliance, therefore ventilation and extraction is dealt with. If they were openable there is concern that they would be overlooked from their neighbour.

[REDACTED]

It is highly likely that No 90 will have piled foundations given its location, could we ask that consideration is given to the method of piling used. If piling is within the design submitted for Building Control should this development go ahead, could the CFA (Continuous Flight Auger) or the Silent Piling technique (Volker Ground Engineering) process be implemented, as it is the least disruptive and quietest

technique available. The reason for this is stated above as traditional techniques will cause distress to the residents of No 92 with vibration and noise.

Privacy is a concern, if the boundary planting is cut back for the works, we would like to see a new two-metre-high fence erected along with mature planting so that No 92's private amenity is maintained to the rear garden as well as the front garden.

We look forward to hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

Kind Regards,

Alex Reeves

Kind Regards,

Dear Louis

Re: Planning Application under Town & Country Planning Act 1990
For: Demolition of existing dwellinghouse. Erection of new dwellinghouse.
At: 90 Wise Road, London, NW7 2RD

I write on behalf of the owner/occupiers of No.92, Wise Road, London, NW7 2RD in supplement to their previous representation in relation to the above current application for planning permission, who request that this letter and its contents are not placed on the public webfile and, following further consideration of the anticipated/potential impact of the current proposals upon the living conditions of No.92 Wise Road, hereby formally request the Authority attach the following conditions to any planning permission:

- 1. All side windows (including rooflights) be both permanently obscure glazed and fixed (non-opening):** The architects supporting statement states on p.38 that side windows (including rooflights) 'can' be obscure glazed and this suggestion needs to be made compulsory in order to remove the potential for overlooking and loss of privacy. There is no essential requirement under Building Regulations that windows to rooms not functioning as living rooms (such as bedrooms, lounges and/or kitchens) open where mechanical or other fixed ventilation is practicable;
- 2. Removal of permitted development rights for the creation/insertion of new openings/windows/rooflights into the side elevation/roof:** Having required all side windows/rooflights to be permanently obscured glazed and fixed (non-opening) it is then logical to remove the opportunity for new openings to breach that preceding condition's protection;
- 3. Control of hours and days of working, with prohibition on burning of waste, noise/dust suppression and wheel washing:** Weekends (both Saturday and Sunday) are quiet, peaceful days in Wise Lane and any work on site should be rigidly restricted to between 0900 hrs to 1730 hrs Monday-Friday only. The owner/occupiers of No.92 presently have a member of their family resident with them who is currently receiving long term treatment for a serious condition and requires such peace and quiet be maintained to aid their recovery. Aspects such as noise/dust suppression and ensuring vehicles do not track mud and other materials out onto the public highway or obstruct the shared driveway at any time are sensible requirements to minimise the potential for legitimate sources of complaint during demolition and construction.

In addition, the essential need for any rooflight to the second floor plant room is questioned. The height, position and scale of this rooflight means that it would have an unnecessarily imposing and oppressive impact. As this is neither a bedroom, study or bathroom there would appear no essential need for any window (or even a window of the substantial scale currently proposed) to be provided for a room accommodating essential utilities. Due to the plant room's location at second floor, there would appear no justification for fire escape purposes for an exterior opening due to the lack of safe access from same to ground level.

I would be very grateful if you could acknowledge safe receipt of this letter.

Best Regards

Martin S. Lee

Martin S. Lee, MA MRTPI AMInstLM MTCPA NPIERS NSI
Director & Chartered Town & Country Planning Consultant

