
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 January 2020 00:12
To: Planning
Subject: Re: further comments on 2019/4710/P

I would like to add one final comment to this.

Since the application was made, a large outbuilding at the rear of the garden was constructed out of breeze blocks. I am not objecting to that but it should be considered when evaluating the overall impact of the proposals as so much of the garden is now being developed on.

[REDACTED]
Hello

Further to my previous comments on 2019/4710/P I would like to add some further comments given there are now updated diagrams.

[REDACTED]
0219 PP Rev 01 - Proposed

- The Proposed Rear Elevation incorrectly shows the garden level at 5 hillfield as 1.82m. Most of the extension, 5 Hillfield is actually 5-10cm lower than the proposed extension ground level, and at the top of the steps it is raised just 1.17m, and at 5 metres back from the bay at number 3 it is 1.35 metres - not 1.82m. This point is approx 2 metres past the rear most stepped part of the extension that would share the boundary. This will mean the extension is much more overbearing and visible than the drawing may suggest - the drawing may be showing the height much along the garden, past the rear of the proposed extension.

Rear elevation 45deg line illustration

- The diagrams indicate 5 Hillfield is actually slightly higher than 3 Hillfield - note the black lines with a disjoint in at the bottom of the diagram. This is incorrect, in fact 5 Hillfield Road is at least 5-10cm lower than 3 Hillfield. This is demonstrated on other diagrams that were submitted (and shown as 20cm difference). This means the light tangents drawn are too high and should in fact intersect lower down.
- The glass door/window to the bedroom at 5 Hillfield with a 45 degree angle, shown to the right of 5 hillfield, next to the boundary with number 3, this is shown much larger than it is:
 - The drawing says it is 2.17m high, it is in fact 20cm lower/shorter
 - The drawing says the window is 1.33m wide, it is in fact 96cm. It also is not mostly glass as drawn, the glass panes are much smaller with lots of wood running down the middle and in between the panes.
 - The drawing has drawn a 45deg angle from 1.6m high, this is virtually at the top of the window when using accurate measurements as above and should be lower when accounting for the following point.
 - The 1.6m high line does not account for the fact the floor level inside 5 hillfield is lower than the outside ground level, it is approx 15cm lower than outside - these are the original floorboards. Drawing the line 1.6m relative to the inside level would be 15cm lower.
 - Forgetting the above inaccuracies, I am not sure why the light tangent is not drawn from lower down than 1.6m, especially since this room is not very deep and the window is in the corner (it is rectangular in shape) - at least at the midpoint but if anything the angle should

be drawn towards the bottom of the window to account for the shape of the room and aspect.

- If the measurement was taken considering the above, the angle would intersect much lower than it has indicated.
- The diagrams does not demonstrate the impact of the depth/length of this extension. Since it is so long and high, the overall impact, including a 45 degree horizontal line would demonstrate a significant impact to daylight. The horizontal line would be close to zero degrees to have a clear path.
- The diagrams draw the roof extension too low - it was made significantly higher than the roof at 3 hillfield, and increases in height over the rear addition and is wider than indicated over that. This further reduces day light.
- The diagrams do not make note of the two additional windows facing 3 Hillfield. These are
 - the bathroom window facing the 4m high walll, this window provides important light during day time hours into the hallway and to the room itself. This would be made further worse if the infill wall was extended further.
 - the bedroom window facing 3 hillfied at the final stepped part of the rear addition. This attracts a lot of light during the afternoon periods but the sun is low at that point so a wall at 3.2m would completely block this.

It should also be noted that this property is north facing going into this raised garden with a slope, with most of the windows benefiting from daylight light in the west/northwest direction and again mostly when the sun is low towards the end of the day. Considering this, even if a window could have a clear angle to the sky at 45 degrees, it would never receive much light as the angle would need to be open lower down. This would be different if the aspect was different.

Best regards

