

[REDACTED]

From: Rae Fether [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 March 2025 17:51
To: Planning
Subject: Application 2025/0149/P

[REDACTED]

Application 2025/0149/P

Dear Sarah White

DPCAAC strongly objects to this application.

DRAWINGS

The 100.1 scale drawings have virtually no dimensions.

The small scale given was inadequate with 100.1 scale drawings, to accurately measure and assess this application.

There were no crucial front elevation drawings.

SIDE EXTENSION

The proposal is to rebuild the existing side extension approximately 8m further to align with the back of the building. However this is significantly further forward than the back of no 104 and that together with the raised party wall from 2m to 2.8m will result in loss of light along the flank wall and into their back windows. It will seriously affect their amenity and enjoyment of their garden.

The applicant says the extension will not be higher than existing, this cannot be confirmed from the drawings. The applicants Planning Statement states “the boundary wall will only be raised to a height of 2.8m matching the height at the front”. This is incorrect as no 104 has confirmed that the wall is 2m in height along its whole length. At the front the height of the existing extension is hidden behind non matching sloping brickwork. This was installed around 2018 and unfortunately not picked up by the DPCAAC. It is entirely out of place and jarring with the horizontal top at no 104; all other side entrances in this part of the street have horizontal tops. Proposed drawing no 337/P7 shows the brickwork still remaining and apparently standing higher than the new extension. If the Council is minded to grant this application, which we think they should not, it should be removed and replaced by a wooden horizontal top and if necessary the height of the extension lowered so as not to be visible from the street. Please see attached image of no 102 from Google Street view.

The 2009 DPCAAMS describes this part of Chetwynd Road in 7.47 and notes nos 64-114 Chetwynd Road were buildings that made a positive contribution. This cannot now be said of no 102 unless the sloping brickwork on top of the side wall is removed.

CHANGE OF BACK FIRST FLOOR WINDOW TO A DOOR

The proposal is to change the first window to a door. Although railings are shown as a balcony in elevation, railings are shown in the side elevation extending 2m onto the flat roof suggesting the intention is for use as a terrace. Whether terrace or balcony being further forward than no 104 it would afford a direct view into their ground floor rooms and garden and would be a gross invasion of their privacy.

Rae Fether
on behalf of the DPCAAC

