

Application Reference No.: HGY/2024/0606

Site Address: Ground Floor Flat 24 Alexandra Park Road London N10 2AB

Comments by: Lorenzo Coppi and Barbara Verardo

From: 26 Alexandra Park Road London N10 2AB

Submission: Objection

Comments: We are boundary neighbours. We object to the proposed design due to the overbearing nature of the proposed development on our property, and the significant loss of amenity and outlook, and the substantial overshadowing and loss of daylight that it would cause us.

The rear building line of the host building projects further rearwards beyond the rear building line of our linked property at no. 26 by approximately 1.5 metres. Moreover, the submitted plans do not show that the floor of the garden, patio and side extension (kitchen) of our property at no. 26 is approximately 1.1 metres below the floor of the proposed rear extension.

This implies that the proposed rear extension would project beyond the rear living room windows of our property at no. 26 by 5.30 metres, with a height on the shared boundary of 3.50 metres (2.40 of the extension plus 1.10 of the difference in height between the floor levels of the two sites), rising to 4.30 metres (3.20 plus 1.10). This would project approximately 1.10 to 1.90 metres above the current high fence.

Because of this, we have three distinct objections:

1. As the pictures in the next pages show, the visually prominent and overbearing nature of the proposed extension when viewed from the adjacent ground floor rear windows of our property at no. 26 would result in an unacceptable loss of outlook and amenity.
2. Moreover, the extension would create significant overshadowing and a loss of daylight on the French window of our living room (which would be entirely within the 45 degree shadow area of the new proposed extension), and partially on the French window of our side extension (kitchen), which would also be partially within the 45 degree shadow area of the new proposed extension. Indeed this is confirmed by the basic solar study enclosed with the application, which shows significant extra shadowing on our rear windows, especially in winter.
3. Because of its identical concept and very similar size, the proposed plan is not substantially different in terms of impact on our property from application HGY/2020/1428 (an analogous extension on the same site), which was denied as (amongst other things) it would have resulted in an unacceptable impact on neighbouring amenities. Given the current proposal is only marginally different from proposal HGY/2020/1428, it stands to reason that the same issues apply here.

For these reasons, we regret to have to object to the proposal.

These problems may be mitigated if the height of the proposed extension could be reduced so not to exceed significantly the height of the existing boundary fence (possibly by digging by around 1.10 metres, to bring the floor levels of the two properties at the same level), or if the extension could be made of architectural glass (with a requirement of not installing blinds), so that the development would create less of an overbearing effect, and light could be let through the extension to our windows and patio.

View from living room window – before



View from living room window – after



View from kitchen window – before



View from kitchen window – after



View from patio – before



View from patio – after

