

Subject: Further comments on revised plans – Planning Application 260727, 57 Arundel Road

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing to provide further comments on the revised plans submitted on 24 August 2026 in relation to planning application 260727 at No. 57 Arundel Road.

We appreciate that the revised proposal has addressed some of our previous concerns, including the changes to the roof design and the revised orientation of the new bathroom window. However, we remain concerned about the following matters.

1. Scale and dominance of the proposed extension

Although the revised proposal sets the new master bedroom back by approximately 900mm, the overall length of the extension appears to remain unchanged (refer to the Existing and Proposed First Floor Plans – Rev A). The rear part of the proposed extension would still extend beyond the existing single-storey extension at No. 59. In our view, this would continue to make the proposed two-storey extension appear dominant and oppressive when viewed from our property and garden. The issue is particularly significant because a substantial part of No. 57's rear garden has already been used for a raised platform and outbuilding. The proposal would now introduce a further, lengthy two-storey extension into what is already a significantly developed rear garden.

Although the revised design may reduce the impact in one section, it does not appear to address the overall length, bulk and massing of the proposed extension. We respectfully ask the Council to assess the cumulative visual impact of the raised platform, outbuilding and proposed two-storey extension, rather than considering the extension in isolation.

2. Boundary and future maintenance access

We would also like to draw attention to the ownership and position of the boundary fence between the two properties. The fence is owned by No. 57, and one side of the fence is attached to the external wall of our property.

The proposed ground-floor rear extension nevertheless appears to remain directly on, or immediately adjacent to, the boundary line (refer to the Existing and Proposed Ground Floor Plans – Rev A). It does not appear to leave sufficient space for future maintenance, repair or replacement of the boundary fence, or for maintenance of the external wall of the proposed extension. Could the applicant and the Council please clarify how future access for maintenance, repair and replacement will be achieved?

3. Roof projection over the party-wall or boundary line

We also note that the revised drawings show the extension set approximately 250mm away from the boundary at the front section. However, it appears that part of the proposed roof would project beyond, or over, the party-wall or boundary line (refer to the Existing and Proposed Rear Elevations – Rev A). This remains a serious concern for us.

We respectfully ask the Council to take these matters into account when determining the application and, if necessary, to request further dimensioned drawings and clarification from the applicant.

Yours faithfully,

Ying Kit Lau

Homeowners and occupiers of 59 Arundel Road