

Application No: 2023/0419/P - Erection of an additional storey (part of which was granted as Prior Approval ref. 2021/4368/P) at 2 Quickswood NW3 3SJ

Second letter of objection from Ms Helen Janecek, 2 Conybeare NW3 3SD
Date: 03/07/2023

Introduction

This second letter of objection is intended to be read in conjunction with my first letter of objection posted on the planning authority website on 24/04/2023 and 25/04/2023. I am responding within the new consultation period ending on 03/07/2023.

In the conclusion to my previous letter I requested that no decision be made in favour of this application until:

1. the applicant had submitted a new complete and accurate daylight and sunlight assessment prepared in accordance with the BRE guidelines, and
2. proper consideration was given to the substantial impact of the proposed development on the garden of 2 Conybeare on its own merits, and
3. that such consideration include a site visit to the garden of 2 Conybeare by the planning officer.

I note that a revised daylight and sunlight report was posted on the planning authority website on 07/06/2023 and the consultation period extended to 02/07/2023, although the notice affixed to the lamp post opposite 2 Quickswood states that the consultation period ends on 03/07/2023. Paragraph 11.2 of the revised daylight and sunlight report concludes:

“The results of the analysis demonstrate that in all instances the aims of the BRE guidelines are achieved. The proposals will therefore not have a significant effect on the neighbour’s [sic] enjoyment of daylight and sunlight.”

Whereas the aims of the BRE guidelines in respect of the VSC daylight and sunlight calculations may have been achieved, the BRE guidelines also state,

“Another important issue is whether the existing building is itself a good neighbour, standing a reasonable distance from the boundary and taking no more than its fair share of light.”

I state categorically that the proposed second floor extension over the whole of the dwelling’s L-shaped footprint will have a **substantial** effect on the amenity of my neighbouring house, particularly on the one small enclosed courtyard garden I am able to enjoy.

Paragraph 9.4.1 of the daylight and sunlight report also states **incorrectly** regarding I Conybeare,

“This property is located to the east of the site and has consent to provide residential accommodation over three floors.”¹

Since my first letter of objection, planning applications for first floor extensions to three neighbouring properties have recently been refused on the basis of their negative impact on the amenity of 26 Quickswood NW3 3RS, the fourth house in a similar perimeter block, which has the same orientation as my own house, and also enjoys the benefit of only one enclosed courtyard garden.² The rationale for the refusal of these applications is equally relevant to this application in respect of 2 Quickswood.

Amenity

2 Quickswood is within a perimeter block formed by four L-shaped houses. The four properties, 1 and 2 Conybeare and 2 and 4 Quickswood, have small enclosed rear gardens which abut each other in a tightly enclosed space. 2 Quickswood and 1 Conybeare have additional outdoor amenity spaces abutting King Henry’s Road, larger than the rear gardens; 2 Conybeare and 4 Quickswood only have rear gardens. In addition 2 Conybeare has a small balcony in front of the bedroom built as part of the first floor extension in 2007, setting back the extension within the then required guidelines.³ The rear open air courtyard formed by the abutting rear gardens provides important amenity space to the four houses which rely on mostly indirect daylight and sunlight, particularly in winter.

The excessive bulk and scale of the proposed third floor extension over the whole of the 2 Quickswood L-shaped footprint would comprise a dominant structure of a full additional storey, out of scale with the three neighbouring houses and forming an overbearing massing to the enclosed courtyard gardens. The overbearing nature of the proposed additional storey would increase the sense of enclosure and would result in a detrimental impact on the outlook experienced both in the rear gardens and the rooms on the ground and first floors of the other three properties.^{4,5} Should the owners of 1 Conybeare and 4 Quickswood also add third floor extensions to the whole of their properties, the cumulative effect would be unbearable: I do not intend to add an additional storey to 1 Conybeare.

The argument in this submission also applies to the existing planning permission granted in respect of 2 Quickswood for a partial third floor extension over half the footprint of the property.⁶ The associated delegated report accepted the findings of the daylight and sunlight report commissioned by the applicant and concluded that the partial extension presented no threat to the neighbours’ privacy, but did not take into account the oppressive impact of

¹ The last planning application my current search of the Camden planning website reveals in respect of 1 Conybeare is ref. 2008/3039/P for a first floor extension granted on 18/08/2008.

² 8 Conybeare NW3 3SD ref. 2022/4422/P: refusal issued 14/06/2023

9 Conybeare NW3 3SD ref. 2022/4428/P: refusal issued 14/06/2023

24 Quickswood NW3 3RS ref. 2022/4421/P: refusal issued 14/06/2023

³ Ref. 2007/5114/P: permission issued 05/12/2007

⁴ Camden Local Plan, 2017, Policy A1

<https://www.camden.gov.uk/documents/20142/3912524/Local+Plan+Low+Res.pdf>

⁵ Camden Planning Guidance, January 2021, paragraph 2.14

<https://www.camden.gov.uk/documents/20142/4823269/Amenity+CPG+Jan+2021.pdf>

⁶ Ref. 2021/4368/P: permission issued 19/05/2022

the new structure on the compact nature of the enclosed rear gardens. I would argue that the special configuration of the perimeter blocks of four houses ('courtyard houses') sets them apart from other dwellings in the development and that therefore additional consideration is merited by neighbours' objections to third floor extension applications, particularly by neighbours with only one rear enclosed garden.

Below appear four photographs taken from the three rooms and garden of 2 Conybeare affected by the proposed extension where I have attempted to show the impact of a third storey on the entire footprint of 2 Quickwood, sited diagonally opposite my own house:





Conclusion

Given the scale of the proposed third storey/second floor extension and its anticipated impact on the amenity of 2 Conybeare, I request that:

1. the planning officer conducts a site visit to 2 Conybeare in order that they may describe the exact scale and nature of the impact of the proposed third storey on both the rear enclosed courtyard garden and the three habitable rooms looking on to the garden;
2. a proper assessment is made of the impact of the proposed development, as described above, on the amenity of 2 Conybeare, paying due attention to the London Borough of Camden planning framework;
3. consideration is given to the possibility of withdrawing the existing prior approval already granted to the proposed erection of the partial additional third storey at 2 Quickwood.⁷

⁷ Ref. 2021/4368/P