

**From:**  
**Sent:** 25 January 2024 17:21  
**To:** Planning; Leela Muthoora  
**Subject:** 2023/0419/P+2021/4368/P-2 Quickswood-2023/2672/P-1  
Conybeare  
**Attachments:** 20230419P+20232672P-additional letter3-24.01.2024.pdf

**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]** Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious  
Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc.

Please find attached a letter of objection addressed to the Chairman of the Planning Committee. I should be grateful if you would acknowledge receipt.

Yours sincerely  
Helen Janecek

Councillor Heather Johnson  
Chair, Planning Committee  
Development Management  
Regeneration and Planning  
London Borough of Camden  
Town Hall  
Judd Street  
London WC1H 9JE

25 January 2024

Dear Councillor Johnson

2023/0419/P Erection of an additional storey (part of which was granted as Prior Approval ref. 2021/4368/P) 2 Quickwood NW3 3SJ  
2023/2672/P Erection of additional storey to the principal part of the existing dwellinghouse. 1 Conybeare NW3 3SD

I refer to and attach copies of my two letters to you dated 14 August 2023 and 16 January 2024 regarding the above applications. Also referred to, and to be read in conjunction with this letter, are my letters of objection dated 24 December 2021, 24 April 2023, 11 July 2023 and 1 August 2023; also the addendum dated 29 January 2022, all posted on the planning website. I note that a revised Daylight and Sunlight report dated 20 December 2023 has been submitted in respect of the proposed development at 1 Conybeare.

There have now been submitted the following Daylight and Sunlight reports:

- |                  |             |   |
|------------------|-------------|---|
| 1. December 2021 | 1 Conybeare | Partial third floor on 1 Conybeare                      |
| 2. April 2022    | 2 Quickwood | Partial third floor on 2 Quickwood                      |
| 3. June 2023     | 2 Quickwood | Entire third floor on 2 Quickwood                       |
| 4. December 2023 | 1 Conybeare | Partial third floor on both 1 Conybeare and 2 Quickwood |

There is no Daylight and Sunlight report concerning the **combined impact** of an additional partial third floor on 1 Conybeare and entire third floor on 2 Quickwood, the two applications currently before the Planning Committee.

The Vertical Sky Component (VSC) analyses in the above reports show that the greatest impact in the case of my house, 2 Conybeare, is on the daylight available through Window 4 on the ground floor. This is the main window to the living room, the principle living space in the house. A summary of the relevant figures in the analyses is as follows:

- The first two reports show an existing value in the range 16.5-16.7 and a proposed value in the range 15.2-15.4 in respect of the proposed partial third floors **considered separately**.
- The third report shows an existing value of 16.6 and a proposed value of 13.6 in respect of the entire third floor on 2 Quickwood.

- The fourth report shows an existing value of 14.9 (sic)<sup>\*1</sup> and a proposed value of 13.8 in respect of the proposed partial third floors **considered together**.

What is missing from the list of reports is an analysis of the loss of daylight resulting from a partial third floor on 1 Conybeare and an entire third floor on 2 Quickwood **considered together**. Paragraph 7.5 of the latest report states:

*The numerical values contained in the BRE guidelines are to establish whether the proposals will have a significant effect on the daylight enjoyed by the neighbouring properties and are based initially on a Vertical Sky Component (VSC) analysis. This analysis advises that each window should achieve a VSC of 27% or 0.8 times the existing value. These values are for a suburban location whereas the site is located within an urban location. In such a location, with reference to previous planning appeal decisions, an alternative target VSC in the **mid-teens** is considered more appropriate.*

Even if it is conceded that the nature of the development is urban rather than suburban, (which I do not), a value of 13.8 for the daylight available to the main living area of my house is at the low end of the 'mid-teens' and likely to fall further if the impact on 2 Conybeare of the partial third floor on 1 Conybeare and entire third floor on 2 Quickwood are **considered together**.

Whether or not any further daylight and sunlight analysis is supplied by the applicants, this cannot alter the looming and oppressive nature of the proposed massing and the increased sense of enclosure from either the partial additional third floor on 2 Quickwood for which prior approval has been granted,<sup>2</sup> or the two additional partial third floors on 2 Quickwood and 1 Conybeare, or the additional partial third floor on 1 Conybeare and entire third floor on 2 Quickwood.

In this respect, I again cite the recent precedent of 26 Quickwood, a house in a similar confined perimeter block with the same aspect to the sun, just one street away, where three applications for **first** floor extensions from the three neighbours sharing the courtyard garden space were refused.<sup>3</sup> The report of the planning officer benefited from their site visit to 26 Quickwood which enabled a proper assessment of the impact of the proposed developments on the residential amenity of the property **irrespective** of the potential loss of daylight or sunlight. I urge that a similar site visit be undertaken to 2 Conybeare.

Yours sincerely

Ms Helen Janeczek

---

<sup>1</sup> This needs checking, as does the resulting figure for the % loss of daylight.

<sup>2</sup> 2021/4368/P

<sup>3</sup> 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 Quickwood NW3 3RS ref. 2022/4421/P: refusal issued 14/06/2023

Councillor Heather Johnson  
Chair, Planning Committee  
Development Management  
Regeneration and Planning  
London Borough of Camden  
Town Hall  
Judd Street  
London WC1H 9JE

16 January 2024

Dear Councillor Johnson

2023/0419/P Erection of an additional storey (part of which was granted as Prior Approval ref. 2021/4368/P) 2 Quickswood NW3 3SJ  
2023/2672/P Erection of additional storey to the principal part of the existing dwellinghouse. 1 Conybeare NW3 3SD

I attach a copy of the letter I wrote to you on 14 August 2023, to which I have received no reply, regarding the above planning applications, in respect of which, according to the planning application website, there appears to have been no progress. Item 8 of the minutes of the 30 October 2023 planning committee meeting contains the following paragraph:

*Referring to the process for blitzing applications, the list of applications was looked at, the applications were grouped according to the type of application, those applications that could be dealt with quickly were pulled out and dealt with. The more complex applications that could not be blitzed were pulled out and allocated to officers to be dealt with.*

It would appear that the above applications have fallen to the bottom of a large pile. Another paragraph of the minutes includes the words,

*...the main thing customers wanted was good communication. Most people were understanding about delays when they were informed what was going on and at what stage they were at in the process. The communication with customers had improved, the Council would continue to build on this.*

I am 71 years of age: suppose I were to become seriously ill and need to sell my house to pay for residential care? I would be unable to do so because any disposal of the property, including obtaining a secured loan, is currently sterilised.

I therefore reiterate the request made at the end of my previous letter that, given the scale of the proposed third storey/second floor extension and its anticipated impact on the amenity of 2 Conybeare:

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 Quickswood.<sup>4</sup>

Yours sincerely

Helen Janecek

---

<sup>4</sup> Ref. 2021/4368/P

Councillor Heather Johnson  
Chair, Planning Committee  
Development Management  
Regeneration and Planning  
London Borough of Camden  
Town Hall  
Judd Street  
London  
WC1H 9JE

14 August 2023

Dear Councillor Johnson

2023/0419/P Erection of an additional storey (part of which was granted as Prior Approval ref. 2021/4368/P) 2 Quickswood NW3 3SJ  
2023/2672/P Erection of additional storey to the principal part of the existing dwellinghouse. 1 Conybeare NW3 3SD

I am writing to request that when the above two applications are considered by the planning committee, they are considered **together**, not separately. This letter is to be read in conjunction with two objections in respect of 2 Quickswood and one objection regarding 1 Conybeare I have already submitted within the respective consultation periods.

There are two reasons for this request: firstly, the combined effect of the two proposed additional **second** floor extensions would together have a greater impact on my house and garden in terms of bulk, loss of amenity and loss of light; secondly, recent precedent. Earlier this year the committee refused permission for three proposed **first** floor extensions neighbouring an identical house with the same aspect as mine (26 Quickswood NW3 3RS), just one road away:

*2022/4421/P Erection of a single storey rear extension at first floor level to dwellinghouse 24 Quickswood NW3 3RS (Associated applications at 8 & 9 Conybeare)*

*Reasons for Refusal*

*1 The proposed extension, by reason of its excessive bulk and scale, would not be subordinate to the host building, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the host building and the perimeter block contrary to policy D1 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.*

*2 The proposed extension, by reason of its excessive bulk and scale, would be an overbearing addition within the perimeter block, causing harm to amenity through an increased sense of enclosure and loss of outlook experienced within the rear gardens and neighbouring windows, contrary to policy A1 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.*

My small courtyard garden measures only 2.3 metres long by 2.3 metres wide and is important for my wellbeing. I dread the thought of the proposed extensions reducing the daylight and sunlight I enjoy when relaxing, reading and tending plants in the garden and when in the house. It is impossible to appreciate fully the special character of these courtyard houses forming a small-scale perimeter block, and the outlook from them, until one has entered both the house and the garden. I therefore suggest that a member of the planning committee and/or the responsible planning officer undertake a **site visit** to review

**from within** the house and the enclosed garden space the loss of amenity which would result from the proposed developments. I should be very happy to accommodate a request from the planning committee regarding arrangements to gain access in order to make such a visit.

Yours sincerely

Ms Helen Janecek