

### **Comment on a planning application:**

#### **Application Details:**

**Application:** 24/1388/FUL

**Address:** 37 St Margarets Grove, Twickenham, TW1 1JF

**Proposal:** Construction of single storey rear extension at ground floor level including removal of existing two-storey rear addition to facilitate works. Associated works including creation of new window opening to the rear outrigger at first floor level (amended plans received).

#### **Comments Made By**

**Name:** Jonathan De Mello

**Address:** 39 St Margarets Grove, Twickenham, TW1 1JF

#### **Comments**

**Type of comment:** Objection

Dear Georgia,

I am writing with reference to your letter dated 11<sup>th</sup> October 2024, related to amended plans submitted by No 37 as part of their planning application. I am the owner of 39 St Margarets Grove.

Please note that whilst my views below relate principally to the amended plans, my original comments submitted on the Council website and via email to the Council very much still stand – particularly given there is very little difference between the amended and original plans.

- Correspondence – sunlight/daylight: the rear elevation drawing that has been provided shows very clearly that the loss of light to our property would be very significant – light to our patio doors would be severely impacted (50%+ of current light impacted) and as that is by far the main source of light to our kitchen that is simply unacceptable.
- Report – revised arborist report: Page 9: ‘It should be noted that the tree in the neighbouring garden behind the purple plum consists of suckers from the purple plum’ – this is incorrect. The tree is a separate tree with different blossom (white rather than pink) and fruit (plums rather than cherries). The attached photo (taken in early spring) clearly shows this. It would be badly damaged by any excavation to dig foundations for the proposed extension, not to mention the risk of it falling and damaging ourselves or our property. On Page 12 of the same report, the following statement made is deeply concerning: ‘Assessing the potential influence of trees upon load-bearing soils beneath existing and proposed structures, resulting from water abstraction by trees on shrinkable soils, was not included in the contract brief and is not, therefore, considered in any detail in this report.’ Surely such due diligence needs to be undertaken by No 37 given the potential damage to neighbouring properties?
- Revised Drawing – PL02A(2319), PL01B(2319), PL05A(2319), PL04A(2319): Having reviewed these revised plans in detail there is very little material difference between these and the original plans No 37 submitted. PL05A(2319) (the Rear Elevation plan) in particular has not changed in any sense apart from provision of a little more text detail on various aspects of the proposal. As stated in my original comments, the current fence line (which No 37 proposes to build right up to) does not in any way denote the actual boundary between the two properties. The fence comes some way into my land and needs to be moved to the correct boundary prior to consent for any works being granted. I have provided various detail

on this in prior comments and emails to the Council (together with photos) and these comments very much still stand.

- Again, in terms of the Council's 'material planning considerations' (and to supplement those in my prior note to the Council):
  - Loss of light/overshadowing: The height of the planned extension would materially reduce light into our kitchen – where we spend the majority of our time. It would impact both our patio doors and velux windows. Loss of over 50% of current light will be hugely impactful on our quality of life.
  - Visual amenity: the proposed extension is grossly oversized and out of proportion with other ground floor rear extensions in neighbouring properties – including No 37's immediate neighbours in us and No 35. In addition, the party wall notice sent to us by the surveyor representing No 37 stated that 'it is intended to build at the Line of Junction between our two properties, a new brick wall on concrete footings to replace the existing timber fence and which is intended to be built up to the line of junction.' We have not received a new party wall notice since, so assuming that this still remains No 37's intention, that is not acceptable from a visual amenity perspective. Visually a brick wall built between the two properties would be extremely unappealing; particularly as we would have a wooden fence on one side and a brick wall on the other. No other property on the street - or any street in the area in fact - has been subjected to such a view, nor should they.
  - Overlooking/loss of privacy: Our kitchen and patio area will be overlooked given the height of the proposed extension, which will tower some way above the existing fence.
  - Loss of trees: As stated above, foundations that would need to be dug to facilitate the extension would impact the roots of separate trees on both properties, and potentially also create a major risk of tree damage to our ourselves and our property, should this damage cause either or both trees to fall.
  - Design, appearance and materials: the design is of an extension that is grossly out of place given the scale of extensions of nearby properties - both in height and size. In appearance the extension would be an eyesore that we would have to suffer every day should consent be granted.

Kind Regards,

Jonathan