
From: Bhupi Bahra
Sent: 01 October 2024 23:18
To:
Subject: Planning Application - 2024/3480/P (14 Solent Road NW6 1TU)
Attachments: 16 Solent Road study view photo.jpg

[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.

The following relates to application number: 2024/3480/P (14 Solent Road NW6 1TU). Their "Daylight and Sunlight Study", dated 25th September 2024, was uploaded on 27th September, after all the consultation comments had been entered. We feel we need to respond to the results contained within, as they ignore or underplay some of the most material points of impact to us

The applicants agents in their latest submission accept that our garden will suffer a 24% reduction in its sunlight. This of course exceeds the maximum permissible limit of 20% that may be allowed. Maximum should mean maximum, and their own calculation accepts that it will be exceeded. In our case, its effect would be much worse, as the garden faces north east and only gets small amounts of daylight to begin with. A reduction of this magnitude would cause a serious loss of our amenity.

Their drawing on page 39 shows that the greatest reduction will be in the bottom half section of our garden. This is exactly where our outdoor furniture is placed; the layout of the landscaped garden is such that this is the only possible place to have our outdoor seating. Moreover, it is also the only area that normally gets some patches of afternoon sunshine. Note, there are lots of fences, hedges, bushes and trees around our garden that have not been accounted for in the study, so the impact will in reality be significantly greater than the 24% reduction stated. Perhaps the guideline maximum loss of 20% may be acceptable when facing south. In our view, no loss should be acceptable when facing north east in what is an already very congested neighbourhood.

Similarly, the latest submission completely ignores the impact of light to our window depicted as window 22 (on page 25) where the loss of direct morning sunlight and shadowing effect would be 100%. This is the greatest point of impact to us, and the study has selectively chosen to ignore it in the "Sunlight to Windows" table (Appendix 2).

Importantly, the room behind this window is used as a work-from-home study as well as a children's study, reading and play area. It is a very heavily utilised room, throughout the week and on weekends.

This room only receives morning light (between dawn and mid-late morning) from the east through the one window (see attached photo taken in the morning looking out to the right, to where the wall would be located). This sunlight would be completely blocked by this extension. Currently, the sky to the east is clearly visible from the sofa (positioned facing towards 14 Solent Rd). This visible sky would also be completely blocked by a huge towering brick wall that one would almost be able to touch by opening the window and leaning a little to the right. Note, the position of window 22 is wrongly shown in many of their drawings. In reality it is much closer to the party wall. With the room being as small as it already is, it would feel very suffocating; the wall would be much taller than our dormer and would protrude out beyond it by more than 3 metres. Note, the green shading either side of window 22 on page 37 of the document seems to be incorrect. The whole window and the areas around it DO currently receive visible sky. They will NOT receive any visible sky to the east after the development. Hence, it is not clear why they have been shaded green.

In effect, the room would go from being a lovely work, reading and play space for us and the children, currently receiving a few hours of direct morning sunlight from the east, to one that is cold and uninviting (i.e. devoid of any direct sunlight at any time of day and with a close to 50% reduction in overall visible sky; or a 100% reduction in visible sky when seated in our sofa which faces No 14).

We clarify here that windows 20, 23 and 24 (on page 25) will also see a significant reduction in morning sunlight as a result of the proposed extension. Windows 23 and 24 are windows to my son's bedroom. Since the extension would be much taller than our dormer, the direct morning sunlight to these windows would also be blocked. In the case of

window 20, it is the only source of (already very diminished) light into my daughters bedroom. Again, all these windows have been selectively ignored in the "Sunlight to Windows" table.

This proposal if implemented would result in a serious loss to our family's amenity. We request that the application deserves to be refused.

Kind regards,
B. Bahra