

Email from agent responding to neighbour objections

Dear Clare,

In relation to the above and your previous email, we write to thank you for forwarding through a copy of Paris Smiths Letter of Objection, written on behalf of the owner at No.22 Crowsport Estate.

Following review of this letter and when the comments are considered in relation to the submitted Design Proposal, we would like to briefly summarise our general assessment of these concerns.

1. Overlooking concern, associated with the new Study Rooms front corner window.
We would like to highlight that this window's height is lower than No.22's adjacent Balcony Parapet Wall, thus meaning there can't be any overlooking as the average person's head height at around 1.7m will be lower than the Parapet Wall level (review Drawings P18 and P19). Furthermore, the section of glazing on the South-West corner of this window is due to be obscure glazed, further limiting any ability to look back up at No.22. Additionally it should also be recognised that No.20's proposed First Floor Roof Terrace Parapet Wall height is approximately 1.37m lower than No.22's adjacent Balcony Parapet Wall height, and technically one could argue that No.22 benefits from overlooking parts of No.20's property.
2. Window to window distances.
The currently submitted proposal does not include any windows looking directly into another property, as the primary outlooks are towards the Crowsport Estate Track. Whilst it is recognised No.22 has a number of openings on the Northern Elevation at First Floor, set back addressing their side Roof Terrace Area, these are obscured from sight due to the approximate 1.3m height variations between No.20 at the lower level, and No.22 at the higher level. Furthermore, these openings are positioned at an oblique angle relative to No.20's South-Easterly outlook and adopt a similar configuration to No.22's Ground Floor front corner window, which again benefits from an aspect looking part across No.20 to rear / side garden, which abuts No.22 Front Garden.

In conclusion and given the manner in which these properties relate to each other, as they collectively twist around to the Crowsport Estate Track bend, the current design has been configured to limit any impacts on neighbouring properties and has been tailored to primarily address No.20's rear / side garden offering a South Easterly Aspect.

We trust these points will be considered when reviewing Paris Smiths Objection Letter.

Many Thanks

Regards

Adi Puplampu.
BA. BArch. MARB