
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 October 2018 11:26
To: Chana, Jaspreet
Cc: Planning
Subject: 75 Lawn Rd

FAO: Jaspreet Chana and Camden Planning

Comments on 75 Lawn Road Applications 2018/2136/P

Impact of the front/side extensions upon the amenity of [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] both the subjects of many planning applications over the past year or so. I am therefore responding briefly to the documents, published on the Camden Planning website yesterday regarding number 75. There are many issues in this application to which I have responded previously. The issue of the basement in of particular concern to me – and this is being dealt with separately, so I shall confine my comments to the issue below.

In their documents the applicants state: “Whilst the proposed side extension will be visible [REDACTED] this impact is considered minimal as it will only obstruct views of the flank wall of No.75 Lawn Road (see below visualisation).”

The new visualisation strongly confirms the sense of enclosure, loss of outlook, and ‘tunnel effect’ about which I have previously objected. It is not for the applicants to declare that the impact on me is ‘minimal’. They have absolutely no idea how this room contributes to the outlay and use of my house. This front projection of 2 metres right next to my bedroom window should be refused.

The applicants’ photographs demonstrate how at 1st floor level the front facing walls above the side garages are in the same vertical plane with the next door house, a design feature that avoids creating any sense of enclosure, loss of outlook, and ‘tunnel effect’.

The Rights of Light Consulting report is about light. The 45-degree test “is an assessment of daylight” (CPG – Amenity) and provides a guide for when a BRE daylight and sunlight study may be warranted. It is not a definition of, or test for, assessing the impact of an extension on neighbouring amenity in terms of overbearing, poor outlook, or sense of enclosure.

Yours sincerely,
Ellen Solomon
[REDACTED]