

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/0859/P	Keith Cowell	Flat 1 9 Lymington Road London NW6 1HX	11/03/2025 17:24:28	OBJ	OBJECTION CONTEXT

We are the owner occupiers of the ground floor flat of 9 Lymington Road, adjoining the other half of the semi-detached applicant's property. Our property is very similar in layout and in particular the size, location, and orientation of the living / dining room with a glazed end wall facing north. We share a party wall and consequently what occurs on one side can affect the other. In this case alteration to the size of this room on one side of the semi-detached property will have a consequential impact on the other. No consultation or review of that impact has taken place.

We object to the proposals on the following grounds:

HEIGHT & MASSING

The added projection of 2.3 metres x 4 metres high beyond the existing rear façade on the party wall line will have a detrimental impact on the daylighting and outlook from No. 9's living room. Given the existing eight-metre depth of these living/dining rooms with an intervening archway, any reduction in available daylight will have a significant impact on what is already a poorly lit room.

There is no section provided with the application but as the intention specified within the Design & Access Statement (DAS) is to raise the current flat roof to the ridge level of the pitched roof on the east of the building, over the existing kitchen, it appears this could only be achieved by raising the height of the parapet on the party wall line between the two properties, resulting in a further impact and loss of daylight and outlook.

The addition of a three-dimensional saw-tooth fascia, protruding beyond the 2.3m extension line, supported on timber posts, not only further adds to the extent of impact on daylight and outlook to No.9 but also increases the visual scale of the proposals needlessly and in an inappropriate style.

The paved patio immediately outside of our living room will also be marred by the added projection of 4 metres height, affecting early morning sunlight and depriving light and air to plant beds and planters immediately adjacent to the proposed extension.

With massing of this magnitude, the proposals go beyond what might normally be described as a small rear extension.

The DAS implies that there will be no impact on neighbouring properties and no increase in height. The DAS states: daylighting is not compromised to neighbouring properties. We submit that these are inaccurate and misleading statements.

HERITAGE

As might be expected and as demonstrated on the drawings showing the existing rear elevation, the appearance of both semi-detached properties is very similar to each other, perhaps with the only exception of the roof extension to No.11. In the context of the Conservation Area and its principles, the proposals seek to unbalance that parity and introduce a completely different style

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
					<p>of architecture and materials palette. The size of the proposed extension is justified in the DAS by reference to No.13 Lymington Road, a building divorced from the applicant's property and of a different style and design. No comparison is made against its semi-detached neighbour No. 9 which would be far more appropriate.</p> <p>The introduction of timber as the main form of cladding of the proposed extension is not compatible with the Conservation Area, which is predominately brick.</p> <p>The visual context of the proposals should have a much wider review, not limited to just a view from the rear garden of No.11, as in part, due to the slope of the land rising to the north, the extension will be seen from amenity areas of adjacent gardens of Lymington Road and the upper floor of houses on the south side of Fawley Road. Due also to the low level of shrub planting in both 9 & 11 gardens, the rear of No.11 will be almost fully visible from the garden of No.9.</p> <p>The saw-tooth projecting canopy to the proposed extension, supported on timber posts, seems entirely inappropriate and an unnecessary architectural whim.</p> <p>The extensive proposed skylight provision is similarly inappropriate within the conservation area as it will have the effect of an illuminated roof when lit internally, not only affecting the upper floor neighbours of both 11 & 9, but also, most clearly from the outlook of the upper floors in Fawley Road (south) providing a flood lit façade of the upper storeys.</p> <p>LIGHT & NOISE POLLUTION</p> <p>As above the proposed use of nine openable 'skylights' will have a direct impact on adjacent properties. When artificial lights are necessarily used in the proposed new extension at dusk and during evenings the amount of light pollution to upper floor accommodation of both 11 & 9, as well as a much wider audience will be significant. The rear façade will be washed with light from the extensive proposed rooflights.</p> <p>The proposal for nine skylights is presumably to supplement inadequate natural light, emphasising the comment above about the limited level of natural light to the existing living/dining rooms. Proposing to extend the property in height and length, necessitating the extensive skylights, can only be achieved at the expense of depriving No.9's rights of light.</p> <p>The living dining room is currently roofed by a flat roof with no existing rooflights providing some degree of noise containment. Exchanging this for openable skylights will allow noise pollution to impact neighbours.</p> <p>The extent and position of the proposed skylights are also likely to be in contravention of the Building Regulations Part B relating to the necessary protection from fire spread to adjacent properties.</p> <p>Currently the pair of semi-detached houses match room use at ground floor level on either side of the party wall, bedrooms at the front, living/dining at the rear. By relocating the existing kitchen into the proposed extended living room, the dynamic of that balance is broken. Kitchen activity, processes, white goods noise and vibration and extraction etc all add to a potential noise intrusion into the adjacent property. No details of any false walls or acoustic insulation are given and the shared chimney is shown as opened up increasing the concern that 'quiet enjoyment' will be affected.</p> <p>AMENITY</p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
					<p>The proposals will reduce the extent of garden and external amenity area of the applicant's property, as well as having an impact on the neighbours, as above.</p> <p>The provision of a token green roof strip does not compensate for this impact. As there is no obvious safe access to this roof from ground level it is unlikely to receive any maintenance, without which it may easily become an eyesore to all the upper apartments of both 9 & 11.</p> <p>OVERLOOKING & PRIVACY</p> <p>The extent of skylights is such that the upper floor apartments of both 9 & 11 will look into the proposed extension and may themselves be seen from below when looking out of their upper windows.</p> <p>DESIGN</p> <p>Both properties have a history of and ongoing concern with subsidence. Although not directly a planning matter, due consideration needs to be embodied within any proposals for the buildability and consequences of construction to both halves of the semi-detached property.</p> <p>The proposals should not be merely considered on their own merits, particularly in the case of a semi-detached house, where any inappropriate design, style, or scale of development would have impact on all aspects of the pair of properties as a whole.</p>
