

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/3480/P	David Sowray	22/09/2024 14:16:23	INT	<p>Document: 1759_14 Solent Rd_AD-2001_Proposed Section AA&BB.RevD (Proposed Section BB) The slope of the roof of the extended outrigger is not consistent with the height of, and is taller than, the neighbouring properties at numbers 12, 10, 8 and 6 Solent Road. As a result it will block light to the west facing windows and part of the garden at 12 Solent Road.</p> <p>Painted Brick (Proposed Section BB) - the plans suggest painted brick at the top elevation of the east facing outrigger. However, it is stated in the document that, "THE MATERIALS USED FOR THE REAR LOFT EXTENSION WILL BE MADE TO MATCH THE MATERIALS ON THE HOST DWELLING." The host dwelling is unpainted brick, therefore painted brick is inconsistent. 12, Solent Road would have a view directly onto the painted brick. It is suggested instead that the brickwork match the existing brickwork. If painted brick is to be permitted, then Camden Council should advise on what paint work would be appropriate.</p> <p>Document: 1759_14 Solent Rd_AD-3001_Proposed Elevations.RevF In two images (3D View 1_Proposed and 3D View 2_Proposed) it can be seen that the proposed slope of the roof for the north outrigger elevation is significantly higher than that of 12 Solent Road. The images show the shadow cast across the west facing area of 12 Solent Road due to the pitch. Referring to the photo (north elevation) in document 1759_14 Solent Rd_AD-3000, it clearly shows the natural sunlight that is presently available and therefore how much light will be blocked.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/3480/P	B Bahra	22/09/2024 11:06:01	OBJ	<p>In response to application number: 2024/3480/P (14 Solent Road NW6 1TU), we (of the adjacent property at 16 Solent Rd) raise the following objections.</p> <p>Their assessment ("Design and Access Statement") is not wholly accurate. Whilst there are numerous examples of new rooflight and rear dormer extensions in the area, to our knowledge there are no outrigger "extensions". The house at No 12, which is being cited as an example, was originally built with a full height brick-structure rear footprint, from the ground floor all the way to the top floor, with a symmetrical pitched roof set across both No 10 and No 12 (as a pair). The drawings of the existing elevations ("3D View 1_Existing", "3D View 2_Existing") show this very clearly. There are only 3 such pairs of houses to the SE of us on Solent Road (inc. Nos 10 & 12) but, to be clear, they are not extensions. They're part of the original builds, all utilising the same original bricks, and they all come in pairs with symmetrical pitched roofs.</p> <p>What's being proposed here would be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The first complete ground-floor-to-roof outrigger in the vicinity that isn't an original build; 2. The first complete ground-floor-to-roof outrigger in the vicinity that pertains to only one property and not a pair - i.e. "a half outrigger". The proposed elevation plans show this oddly protruding, tower-like, structure very clearly (see "3D View 1_Proposed", "3D View 2_Proposed") - it looks nothing like Nos 12 & 10 next door, that are being cited as examples; 3. The first example of a split chimney stack, with half the stack raised up high and the other half still at its original level. Note, the current level of the chimneys, as drawn in "3D View 1_Existing" and "3D View 2_Existing" is incorrect. They are much lower, reaching to about half the height of our dormer, not past the top as is shown. <p>We feel that, if approved, it would set an unwelcome new precedent on Solent Rd.</p> <p>The majority of the houses on Solent Road, all to the NW of us, have smaller top floor rear footprints - e.g. No 14, No 16, No 18, No 20 and many others along that side of the road. They are the ones with extensions, very specifically in the form of pod-like, light-build, slate-finished rear half-dormers. All of these dormer extensions have been very deliberately set further back and take up only a portion (usually less than half) of the floor bellow's rear room footprint.</p> <p>We have one such dormer. It's used as a work-from-home study and children's homework space, so is occupied throughout the day, virtually every day. It's window is NE facing and looks over the Solent Rd and Narcissus Rd gardens. Currently there are clear views of the sky and the gardens & houses opposite to either side. Being NE facing, the afternoon/evening light into it is of course very diminished. However, the morning light is currently adequate, with the eastwardly rising sun shining into the room and being directly visible from the position of the sofa and when looking out to the right of the window. If this "half outrigger" is approved, it would tower over our dormer and protrude out well beyond it. Its side wall would be located about 1 metre away from our study window and would therefore be the only thing visible from the position of the sofa.</p> <p>There is no doubt that it would completely deprive us of the easterly morning sunlight and fully block out the right-side sky and garden views. Chart "3D View 1_Proposed" in the proposed elevations shows just how</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>imposing it would be next to our little dormer. The shadow that has been drawn in on "3D View 1_Proposed" is a very accurate representation - it would literally cast itself over our entire study window, as is shown. Note that, in reality, our window would be a lot closer to the new wall than is inaccurately depicted in these charts.</p> <p>In summary, not only would this type of construction be an unwelcome new precedent in the area, with all the houses to the NW of us - i.e. the majority of the houses on Solent Rd - being able to cite it in future, it would also block out our views and very materially diminish our morning sunlight into a heavily used room in our property. The Camden Council planning officer should feel free to visit us and assess for themselves.</p>
