

[REDACTED]

From: Tim Lyford [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 March 2025 19:24
To: Planning
Subject: Fwd: 30 Solent Road NW6 Planning Application 2025/0034/P - revised plans 13 March 2025

You don't often get email [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Tim Lyford [REDACTED]
Date: 17 March 2025 at 22:54:39 GMT+11
To: planning@camden.gov.uk
Subject: 30 Solent Road NW6 Planning Application 2025/0034/P - revised plans 13 March 2025

We are the owners of No.32 Solent Road and directly affected by the works proposed in the revised plans submitted 13 March 2025 in relation to the original plans referenced 2025/0034/P. The revised plans are headed:

- 2411_PA GA 2020 REV B
- 2411_PA GA 2021 REV B
- 2411_PA GA 2012 REV B

(collectively the 'revised plans').

As before, we are still residing in Australia, and only became aware of these revised plans during a check in on the progress of the responses to the previous application.

Again, we have not been given any notice by or received any communications from the applicants about their revised plans. We understood from the neighbor at No 28 that the owners of No 30 had considered withdrawing their planning

application but this does not seem to be the case after the submission of the revised plans.

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

We strongly object to the revised plans submitted. Our objections to the revised plans are consistent with our objection to the original application dated 12 February 2025.

We note that the owners of No 30 are now attempting to sidestep a number of our previous objections contained in our email of 12 February 2025 by creating a pastiche of what a rear second floor extension to the existing first floor may have looked liked had it been built when the row of terraces was first created.

For the sake of clarity we repeat our objections made in our email of 12 February 2025, modified as needed by the need to take into account the revised plans:

1) *Bulk and scale* – as before, 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.

In this case, the new grossly enlarged brick addition is even bigger than before (it is no longer set back at all), and being made entirely of brick will be large and garish and dominating (like the existing ground floor extension). We therefore consider the revised plans not acceptably scaled and positioned consistent to our objections to the original plans. We repeat the Camden Council's '*Home Improvement Planning Guidance*' [dated January 2021] 2.1.1 which 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 – as before, 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. There is now no attempt for the extension to be subordinate but instead it 'pretends' to have been a second floor extension that was part of the original design.

- 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. 'Pretending' that the second floor extension was an original part of the house does not preserve its architectural proportions and style, and looks more like a garish pastiche.

We note that the owners of No 30 may seek to justify their revised plans by looking across the back gardens to the rear structures of the houses in Narcissus Road, some of which have second and third floor extensions. However, these houses are much more substantial and the extensions were built at the time so are in keeping with the design and proportions of these houses. The houses in Solent Road are much smaller and have much less ability to be able to absorb substantial additions without destroying their character and architectural style.

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

Comment – as before 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. There is now no setback (which still did not make it acceptable under the original plans), and this makes it even worse in terms of size and domination over the neighbours’ gardens.

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

Comment – the revised plans are even worse than the original plans (which were also unacceptable). The new substantial brick 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. The substantial amount of brickwork at such a height above the modestly sized houses on the Solent Road side will block the daylight to our second floor to an unacceptable extent. 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 substantial amount of brickwork at such a height and the addition of the large sash window 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 – we repeat the comments in our original objection. 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 on the Solent Road side. 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 revised plans proposed extension to the second floor 'outrigger' breaches each of these reasons for accepting the previous subordinate addition permitted under 2021/5082/P and in a much more substantial and overbearing way, so we repeat these reasons here again in the context of the revised plans:

- 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 in new substantial brickwork, 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 Morgon (which purported to deal effectively with a less bulky and substantial structure so is even less relevant), 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 revised plans compound this point, particularly in relations to the attempt to obtain a full size second floor extension through creeping extension applications.

As noted previously, 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. The revised plans appear to promise a much lengthier and more disruptive process as a huge amount of new brickwork is proposed to be built at the second floor level. There will also be increased engineering and support work required to add a substantial structure to old brickwork.

Therefore, we repeat the same applicable point that 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 extensive period of intensive disruption, noise, vibration, dirt and damage.

The revised plans are now more transparent in supporting our objection to the 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 because it's trying to add a second floor and 'pretend' that it was part of the original design.

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 again request you assess the 2025/5082/P original and revised plans 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 have the full support of the owner of No 28 in again stating this addition to the second floor should be rejected in full for all the previous reasons stated by them (together with any objections against the revised plans), and by us for the reasons stated in this revised 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