



Dear Mr Marfleet,

We are writing this further to our objection of 7th December 2016.

Now that the applicant has submitted a Design and Access Statement, we can see that it is claimed there are no issues of adverse effects on sunlight affecting neighbouring properties, but this is not so: as stated in our previous objection, Summer sunlight at no.67 will be significantly affected, but this might be mitigated by ensuring that the height of the proposed extension is as low as possible.

The Statement compares the proposed length with that of no. 61 (2013/0673/P) but does not mention the comparative heights, a significant factor in loss of light and sunlight estimates. As the techniques of the drawings differ in the representation of the flat roofs and no measurements are given for either application, it is not possible to be precise about their respective heights, so if the Council decides to grant planning permission, we would ask that it puts a limitation to the overall height of the proposed extension so that it is no higher than the extension at no.61.

One further point on which we should like clarification: the Statement describes a slate-clad pitched roof "adjacent to the boundary with number 63". However the west flank elevation clearly states that the boundary wall will be rebuilt. If this rebuilt boundary wall is to become the exterior wall of the extension, then there is yet further severe adverse effect to the property at no. 63.

We trust you will take these additional points into consideration when making your decision.

Yours sincerely,
Sarah Courtin and Chuck Despina