

The Brixton Society

Understanding the Past, Looking to the Future

Reg'd. Charity No.1058103, Registered with the London Forum of Amenity Societies

Website: www.brixtonsociety.org.uk

Lambeth Planning,
(Development Management)
PO Box 734,
Winchester,
SO23 5DG

Please reply to:
Alan Piper, RIBA,



APiperBrix@aol.com

28 August 2019

For attention of:
Maylinne Nasa,
mnasa@lambeth.gov.uk

Your ref:
19/02709/FUL

42 SULINA ROAD, SW2 – Proposed Extension etc:

Dear Ms Nasa,

Thank you for your recent letter about the above application. This house forms part of a distinctive group within the historic core settlement at the top of Brixton Hill. After receiving representations from the residents' association, the Society **objects** to the proposed extension and alterations because they are not in keeping with the context or current policies, as described more fully below.

Inadequate Information:

It is difficult to understand the justification for this proposal when the applicants have not provided a Design & Access Statement or equivalent. Worse, the Council itself has failed to make even the application form available on its website, which is necessary for the most basic information about the application, including materials.

Insufficient Regard for Heritage Context:

The applicant's drawings fail to recognise that No.42 is the end house of a terrace of three (42, 43, 44). Such drawings should show all 3 houses, at least in outline, in order to clarify the relationship with immediate neighbours, and specifically the impact on the street scene.

Sulina Road and nearby parts of New Park Road still include several surviving small houses and shops from the period 1800-1840. These should be treated as heritage assets.

In addition, this terrace is unusual in being set at right angles to Sulina Road. At present it reads as a single entity, with no extensions disrupting the characteristic hipped slate roof of the early 19th century.

Rear Extension Design:

We are alarmed to see that a full-width extension is proposed at 1st floor level. For any small house, such a proposal would need to satisfy paras 3.7 & 3.11 of the Council's SPD on Building Alterations & Extensions. This patently does not. Specifically, for an early 19th century building such as this, paras 3.3 & 3.4 of the SPD prefer a "closet return" treatment which is not full-width and is subordinate to the main block.

In addition, we are concerned that the ground floor French windows to the rear garden (south-east elevation) do not align with the width of the 1st floor extension above.

Overall, the design fails to comply with policies Q2(i), Q5(b), Q11(a) and Q11(c) of the Lambeth Local Plan.

Daylight & Sunlight Impacts:

The proposals do not have regard to accepted daylight angles, and no daylighting calculations have been provided to assess the impact on the south-east-facing windows of Nos. 43 & 44.

The orientation is such that the 1st floor rear rooms of No.43 (next door) will apparently lose most of their sunlight between 10 am and 3-30 pm.

The design therefore fails to meet policy Q2(iv) of the Lambeth Local Plan.

The adverse impact on the outlook from No.43 also contravenes policy Q2(iii).

Roof Lights

Roof-lights set within the roof-slopes will be acceptable, though in this context it will be preferable for them to conform to the Conservation Roof-light pattern, rather than the chunkier design of standard Velux roof windows.

This is to ensure compliance with policies Q5(b)iv, Q8(b), Q11(l) and SPD para 4.17.

Yours sincerely,



Hon. Secretary