Natasha Campbell
Planning and Building Control
2 Bristol Avenue
Colindale
London
NW9 4EW

Mr D E Rice and Mrs S Rice
4 Church Way
Whetstone
London
N20 0LA

22nd May 2023

Your reference:- 23/1290/HSE

We request to speak at the Committee hearing.

Dear Ms Campbell,

N0 6 Church Way N20 0LA – Part single, part two story side and rear extentions.

We have now reviewed the amended plans submitted by the applicant and whilst we welcome these changes to the original application they do not address the major concerns that we have raised with the LBB.

The information contained in the amended plans do not give us sufficient information to allow us to make a detailed assessment of the revised plans examples are given below.

Rear View:- This shows a maximum height of 2969mm yet if you look to the left of the drawing you will see that the wall of the extension is of a greater height but there is no measurement against this?

First Floor:- This shows the building extending towards our property and has a measurement of 2625mm which leaves 1000mm, the drawing then shows what appears to the overhang of the roof and guttering by an additional amount but contains no measurement of this extension. So is there a clear 1000mm gap?

Block Plan:- This shows the reduced side extension just coming past our shed marked on that plan, however in reality it actually extends past the shed by some 25% according to our measurements.

We are lay people not Architects/Planners and in order to make informed decisions we need to be in possession of all the facts and believe it is part of the duty and responsibility of LBB to see that this is done.

Our main objection to the amended plans is that there is still the proposal to build up the boundary line between the two properties. We have submitted detailed evidence that should this be approved there would a significant loss of light and overshadowing of our property certainly along the lower part of our South facing flank wall which would impact several of our rooms as indicated in our previous

submission this would not be alleviated by the revised proposals and would in our opinion affect our amenities by restricting natural light to existing rooms requiring, artificial light to be used for much of the day certainly outside of the high summer months and even then we would contend on the occasion of dull or cloudy weather which would cost more in energy, be less sustainable and affect our enjoyment of our home. This would be exacerbated by the high level of energy costs and the fact that we as senior citizens on a fixed income.

The amended plans, without any amendment to the building line would still create a real sense of enclosure and have an overbearing impact on our property. It would also create a terracing effect. Your own published guidelines state that 'any build take into account the group character and established form of development along the street and should sit comfortably with neighbouring houses'. The amended plans do not do this. It further states that 'there should be enough space to ensure that the houses appear well separated' the amended plan does not achieve this aim.

Section 14.14 of your published SPD clearly states that where gaps between houses are a common feature of a street, then proposals which close such gaps or create a terracing effect by bringing buildings too close together are likely to be rejected. We would contend that any reasonable person looking at the closeness of our two properties would conclude that by allowing a side development that leaves less than 1m between the two adjacent flank walls would fall into the 'rejected' category. What are the exceptional circumstances or otherwise which would make this guidance not applicable?

The revised application does not show any reduction so the height of the side extension is lower than the height of the original building and there appears still to be no stepping down of the roofline and setting back of the front building line.

There is no information provided to us as neighbours as to what actual changes have been made, in spite of several requests to have a site visit so that the decision making officer can view the actual site we have had no response. We understand that whilst the applicant has been in discussion with LBB we as charge payers have not been given the same opportunity to have any input into the decision making process other by writing.

We have attached an aerial photograph to show the closeness of the buildings as they are at this point in time. It was taken in August and you can see by the direction of the shadow that it is approximately around 1300hrs. Applying the amended application you can ascertain that there would be a shadow from the side new build at a minimum to the height of the small roof on our flank wall. You can also clearly see that it would cause a terracing effect etc, as outlined in our original and current objections.

Your letter to us dated 18th May 2023 and received by us on the 19th May 2023 contains a reference in it about ***'transparency'*** I presume this also includes Officers following the rules, guidance and to act with honesty and integrity especially when dealing with matters of openness.

It has come to my attention that the Planning Department dealing with this case has pre-judged the issues and has already made a decision thereby totally ignoring any further representations we have made in the above comments. It brings into serious doubt that this matter has been dealt with in a fair and equitable manner and It shows that this process is tainted and should be halted forthwith. I intend to make a formal complaint into how this has been dealt with by the London Borough of Barnet.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

Mr Douglas and Mrs Sylvia Rice.