

From: Tim Lyford [REDACTED]
Sent: 12 February 2025 12:44
To: Planning
Subject: 30 Solent Road NW6 Planning Application 2025/0034/P

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

We are the owners of No.32 Solent Road and directly affected by the works proposed in the plans submitted in 2025/0034/P.

We currently reside in Australia, and first became aware of these plans when the current occupiers of No. 32 notified us by sending us a photograph of the street planning notice on 11 February 2025. By this time the consultation period had expired. We understand from the owner of No. 28 Solent Road that the planning notice did not appear in the street until Wednesday 5th February which was after the closure of the consultation period on 3rd February.

We have also not been given any notice by or received any communications from the applicants about their plans. We know that the applicants have our contact details as they resided at No. 32 during the construction period of their previous major extension plans (2021/5082/P) from approximately September 2022 – September 2023.

Like the owner of the other affected property, No. 28 Solent Road, it appears we have not been given a reasonable opportunity to make representations on this planning application, and we should therefore be grateful if you would accept this submission as our representations against it. We note that the Application Progress Summary states that you *'will take account of all representations received right up until an application is determined'*.

As we live in Australia, we should be grateful if all future communication regarding this matter are sent to our email addresses used in this submission.

We strongly object to the planning application submitted. Our objections to the building works are:

1) *Bulk and scale* – the works proposed considerably increase the bulk and scale of the existing second floor 'outrigger', and overturns the reasons for approving the previous plans in application 2021/5082/P which was completed only a year and a half ago. The consent letter for 2021/5082/P noted:

1 Reasons for granting approval:

The second floor extension is considered to be acceptably scaled and positioned in this instance. It is noted there would be some impact to outlook and loss of light to one of the windows to the neighbouring property, No.32,

however given this property benefits from both a standard window and a Juliette balcony at 2nd floor level, and the north-east aspect of the glazing, the impact is considered to be minimal.

We consider the proposed extension is no longer acceptably scaled and positioned. We further note that Camden Council's 'Home Improvement Planning Guidance' [dated January 2021] 2.1.1 requires a rear extension to be '*sensitively and appropriately designed for its context*' taking into account the following relevant principles (amongst others, with our comments against each of the criteria noted in italics):

- a. Be subordinate to the building being extended, in relation to its location, form, footprint, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing;

Comment – the extension of the previously approved subordinate second floor 'outrigger' to the boundary of No. 30's existing first floor bedroom structure and its extension along the party wall at a dominant height means it is no longer subordinate.

- b. Respect and preserve the original design and proportions of the building, including its architectural period and style;

Comment – the extension of the second floor 'outrigger' completely removes the feature of the complementary existing pitched roof on the first floor bedroom structure which currently matches that of No.32. The dominating second floor extension to the 'outrigger' does not preserve the original design and proportions of the building.

- c. Respect and preserve existing architectural features, such as projecting bays, decorative balconies, cornices and chimney stacks;

Comment – the extension of the party wall destroys the feature of the existing chimney stack. It removes this feature and rebuilds it and increases the bulk of the party wall which does not preserve this architectural feature.

- d. Be carefully scaled in terms of its height, width and depth;

Comment – as in the above comments, the 'outrigger' extension is not carefully scaled and is a large dominating addition to the second floor structure.

- e. Respect and duly consider the amenity of adjacent occupiers with regard to daylight, sunlight, outlook, light pollution/ spillage, and privacy;

Comment – the proposed second floor 'outrigger' extension expands the party wall in height, length and bulk, and further removes our daylight, sunlight and outlook amenity. The 'minor' loss of light amenity noted in the previously granted plans, 2021/5082/P, is now doubled (and so is no longer minor) and pays no regard to the loss of amenity we will experience if the plans are granted as submitted. We do not consider that any modification to the proposed second floor 'outrigger' extension add can mitigate against the loss of amenity we will suffer if it is approved. The loss of our amenity was accepted under the previous plans, but it was noted that there would be some impact, so we object to any extension of the second floor 'outrigger' as a matter of principle.

- f. Consider if the extension projection would not cause sense of enclosure to the adjacent occupiers;

Comment – the dominating form of the extension to the ‘outrigger’ along the party wall and to the boundary wall of the first floor bedroom of No. 30 will dominate our back garden and increase the sense of enclosure. The addition of the large windows to the second floor ‘outrigger’ addition, which will no longer be set back, will directly and obtrusively overlook our garden from height, and create a substantial sense of encroachment and substantial loss of privacy.

g. Have a height, depth and width that respects the existing common pattern and rhythm of rear extensions at neighbouring sites, where they exist.

Comment – the second floor extension does not follow the pattern of first floor only extensions, and should not be permitted to break this by allowing a dominating second floor addition when Camden Council’s policy has always been to discourage two storey rear extensions. We note that the Sunlight & Daylight Study prepared by Morgan helpfully includes an aerial photo of the rear of the affected and surrounding properties in Appendix B which clearly shows there are no full size second floor extensions to the boundary of the existing first floor rear extensions. This photo was taken prior to the 2021/5082/P major works undertaken by the applicants.

We further address the impact of the outlook and loss of light to the second floor of No. 32 in objection 2) below.

2) Overshadowing, loss of light, loss of sunlight, loss of outlook and loss of privacy –

We note that under the previous application 2021/5082/P the consent letter stated:

1 Reasons for granting approval:

The second floor extension is considered to be acceptably scaled and positioned in this instance. It is noted there would be some impact to outlook and loss of light to one of the windows to the neighbouring property, No.32, however given this property benefits from both a standard window and a Juliette balcony at 2nd floor level, and the north-east aspect of the glazing, the impact is considered to be minimal.

.....

The proposed new window to the rear of the 2nd floor extension shall create a similar view to the existing window which shall be lost from the rear roof. Given the proposed arrangement closely matches the existing in terms of views, there is not considered to be any negative impact on privacy.

.....

In relation to the extension at second floor, this would project along the boundary with no. 32, and due to its scale and height would restrict the levels of daylight and outlook to the neighbouring dormer window close to the boundary. Given the dormer is also served by a Juliet balcony with glazed double doors, overall it is unlikely that harmful loss of light or outlook would be caused to the habitable space at that level

The proposed extension to the second floor 'outrigger' breaches each of these reasons for accepting the previous subordinate addition permitted under 2021/5082/P:

- a. *overshadowing* – this is addressed in our comments in 1. d. e. & f.
- b. *loss of light/loss of sunlight* – the consent approval for 2021/5082/P notes that the current second floor 'outrigger' does impact on our light in the second floor bedroom but that it is not a harmful amount. The extension to the existing 'outrigger' will dominate the length of the party wall and will now impact the light received into our second floor bedroom in a harmful way, and can no longer be dismissed. We note that the applicant has provided a light assessment report prepared by Morgan, but this appears to contain a number of errors so lacks credibility:
 - i. page 9 refers to windows in 'No. 30' whereas the table refers to 'No. 28'
 - ii. Appendix B page 18 shows windows marked up for 'No. 32' – these are not windows in No.32
 - iii. Details of how the calculations have been done cannot be checked for accuracy
 - iv. Have the calculations been undertaken for the change from pre 2021/5082/P, or from post these works to the works proposed under 2025/034/P. It is not clear or stated
- c. *Loss of outlook* – the consent approval noted that 2021/5082/P creates a similar view for No. 32 to its existing view from the second floor bedroom. We dispute that, as it clearly cuts off a portion of our view right when looking out the Juliette balcony, and completely removed any view we had from the window. The extension to the 'outrigger' will totally any right view from the window, and now will almost entirely remove any view we have looking right from the Juliette balcony. We therefore consider this a seriously impactful loss of our amenity which should not be permitted.
- d. *Loss of privacy* – this is addressed under 1.f. above

2) *Disruption and creeping extension* – the applicants carried out a major extension which took well over a year in 2022-23. This extension substantially remodelled the property and we did not object to this nor did the owner of No. 28. The works caused substantial disruption, and the reasonable assumption of the adjacent property owners was that this was acceptable and would be the end of any other major work for a period. It now seems like the applicants want a second bite of the cherry to add another major addition which should have been dealt with during the first works. If the original work

was insufficient they should have contemplated this during the original plans, and not be able to put their neighbours through another 3 month (minimum) period of extensive disruption, noise, vibration, dirt and damage.

Our concern is this appears to be an attempt to obtain a full size second floor extension through stealth, by undertaking phase 1 of the works, and then adding the final phase 2 (a full size floorplan 2 storey extension) as later additional works.

The tenor of the consent letter approval for 2021/5082/P is that the subordinate second floor 'outrigger' was just about acceptable, and if the 2021/5082/P plans had proposed the 2025/0034/P scheme, it would have been rejected for all the reasons stated above. We therefore request you assess the 2025/5082/P planning application as an extension of the 2021/5082/P plans so they are judged together not separately given the short space of time between the works.

We are therefore in full support with the owner of No. 28 that this addition to the second floor should be rejected in full for all the reasons stated by them, and by us for the reasons stated in this submission.

We would be happy to expand on any of our concerns in subsequent correspondence. As requested, please could any correspondence in relation to this matter be sent to the email addresses used in this submission so we receive it on a timely basis.

Regards

Tim Lyford & Sheridan Lees