

**1, Lyttelton Close  
London NW33SR**

**COMMENT OF PLANNING APPLICATION FOR 2<sup>ND</sup> FLOOR EXTENSION AND 1<sup>ST</sup> FLOOR EXTENSION TO  
112, KING HENRY'S ROAD**

**22<sup>ND</sup> NOVEMBER 2021**

*Permitted development ( PDR) is not a carte blanche , or shouldn't be, to do whatever an applicant wants. The spirit of the PDR is to speed up and simplify the planning process to permit extensions where the impact on adjacent properties is not contentious and has no detrimental effect to the neighbours or streetscape. It should not be abused to do whatever or wherever.*

I am not sure if this application is under PDR because of the proposed 1<sup>st</sup> floor extension . The 2<sup>nd</sup> floor extension could have incorporated a more 'design based' solution, much as the 9 x 4<sup>th</sup> floor extensions to the rear of Elliot Square backing onto KHR which I find a very pleasing design solution, rather than resulting in a mass of brickwork to the side elevation of 112 KHR increasing the brickwork mass from 5 metres high to 8 .2 metres high .

It is interesting to note that in the design and access statement the applicant has not included any photographs of the relationship between 112 KHR and 1 LC ( pertaining to the proposed extension) and I have therefore included those in my excel document of photographs accompanying these comments.

My comments are split into two parts – those which relate to the effect on my own property and those in general to the surrounding properties and streetscape.

The attached photos speak for themselves. Currently the skyline view from my property towards the side elevation of 112 is unimpeded. The sun rises from above 112 and is clearly visible into my 1<sup>st</sup> floor bedroom windows early morning and the skyline view is most attractive. The overlay on the attached photos (which I consider to be an accurate representation) completely eliminates this view. It also creates a feeling of overbearing and claustrophobia given the additional height and proximity to my house – 9.7 metres.

The proposed 1<sup>st</sup> floor extension covers almost 100% of the terrace area save for a very narrow area of planting at the front, which I believe is in contravention of the guidelines as incorporated by CEL . The proposed full length windows/doors view directly into my first floor windows. It might be argued that a similar 1<sup>st</sup> floor extension has been constructed to the rear of 116 KHR but there are differences – firstly approx. 1 metre of terrace still remains and secondly there is a distance of maybe 30 metres between that of 116 to the houses opposite plus any view is partially obstructed by a tree in the communal garden.

The side elevation of 112 KHR is 9.7 metres away from my house. This is probably the closest of any similar positions on the Estate where a flank wall faces a property with windows ( see photos) and creates a feeling of overpowering due to the mass of additional brickwork

The daylight / sunlight report may well be favourable to 112 KHR but it is a scientific based methodology and does not take into account the impact on views from my property which I have enjoyed for the 25 years I have lived here. Having said that, the BRE recommends a 25 degree rule which means that a line drawn from the top of the proposed extension to half way up the ground floor window should not exceed an angle of 25 degrees. In this case the calculation has shown an angle of 34 degrees almost 50% above the BRE recommendation (see attached drawings) and I believe this demonstrates very well what impact this mass of brickwork construction will have on the enjoyment of the current skyline and magnify the sense of overbearing and enclosure to which I have previously referred.

The drawings refer to 30 bricks height of the proposed 2<sup>nd</sup> floor extension ( 30 x 70mm + 75mm + 1025 = total height of 2<sup>nd</sup> floor extension 3.200mm )

The proposed full length windows on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor terrace should reduce in height to match the windows on 4 and 5 Lyttelton Close which face into the Close, particularly as there are windows proposed in the same room facing the side of 5 LC. The front line of the proposed 1<sup>st</sup> floor extension is almost on the same plane as the upper floor windows of 4&5 LC, so reducing the proposed full length windows to the same height as the windows of 4&5 LC ,would match.

The second part of my objection refers to the effect on the surrounding streetscape.

There are 10 houses fronting KHR between the Marriott hotel and Lyttelton Close and a further 5 houses between LC and Lower Merton Rise , all of which are 2 storeys high at 5 metres and fit well into the streetscape with no sense of intrusion into KHR or the houses on the opposite side of the road. ( whilst 112 would be 8 metres + high)

From Lower Merton Rise to Elsworthy Rise the houses have been increased from 3 storeys to 4. The photos attached, illustrate that the height difference to the rear of the 3 storey houses each end of the 9 houses appears minimal and thus has no substantial impact on the window aspect to these facing the side elevation of the 4 storey houses. The design is to be congratulated as it unifies all 9 houses and because the design of the additional storey is different but complimentary to the existing brown brickwork below , it minimises any sense of 'top heaviness' unlike the proposal of 112 where the brickwork simply continues upwards and gives the impression of being overpowering. The 9 houses have all extended upwards so appear as one unit in harmony. 112 would be just one extension upwards out of 15 houses which would look out of keeping with the rest of the streetscape.

The 9 houses referred to above are all set well back from the KHR and although I cannot measure the distance , I am guessing we are talking about 8/10 metres, whilst 112 is set back just 3700 from the pavement line.

There are 2<sup>nd</sup> floor extensions to 5-9 Lower Merton Rise ( 2 storeys to 3) and 13-15 Lower Merton Rise ( 3 storeys to 4 ) They are not single dwellings but have been extended as part of a group of 3 in each case. The roof extensions at 5-9 are not intrusive or overpowering to the houses behind on the other side of the communal garden – 4 and 5 Lyttelton Close – because the ground level from the pavement line in Lower Merton Rise slopes down to the front of the houses quite substantially which means that the roof extensions are visually lower to the surrounding properties and not as apparent as if they were at pavement level – besides 4 & 5 Lyttelton are many metres away from Lower Merton Rise with a communal garden in between.

The 4<sup>th</sup> floor extensions to No's 13-15 Lower Merton Rise are set back from the face of the building and I would estimate at least 30 metres away from the houses opposite and so no detrimental effect to those houses. You cannot see these properties from 4/5 Lyttelton and so no one is affected.

Of course I am aware of roof extension applications across the Hawtrey Estate, but I believe none with this particular aspect whereby a large flank wall is directly in front ( 9.7 metres) of another house facing it's windows and where the skyline is heavily compromised.

At the very least, if the design had followed something similar to that of the 9 x 4<sup>th</sup> floor extensions referred to previous ( I believe them to be vertical panels of lead or similar which wrap around the returns at both ends of the 9 houses) and also form a feature above the windows , I would have been slightly more inclined to have considered the proposal in a more favourable light because the impression of mass and bulk, particularly on the side return of 112 would have been less and there might have been a case to make that it matches the 9 x floor extensions further down KHR – apart from the fact that the design is more attractive.

There is also a slight recess detail between the windows, and a small setback, which breaks up the elevation and is more pleasing to the eye. The property would then retain a feeling of a 2 floor house with the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor extension taking a slightly ' back seat'

I wish to stress that this objection is not an emotional response to a planning application but an objective opinion backed up with photographic and measured evidence ( although that said , the loss of an attractive skyline and a feeling of a mass of masonry substantially higher than exists at the moment , close to my house , carries a certain amount of personal concern)

In view of the above and the attached photos, I object to this proposal in its current form.

Stephen Lewis