

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/0902/P	Mrs Valerie Dann	23/05/2021 11:51:23	OBJNOT	<p>We live at No. 11 Weech Road which is adjoined to No. 10 on the righthand side. We wish to raise an objection to the proposed development on the following grounds:-</p> <p>1. The CPG adopted on 15 January 2021 states in clause 2.1.1 that Rear extensions shall 'be subordinate to the building being extended, in relation to its location, form, footprint, scale, proportion, dimensions and detailing.' It also states a rear extension shall 'Have a height, depth and width that respects the existing common pattern and rhythm of rear extensions at neighbouring sites, where they exist.'</p> <p>The proposed development is for a single storey rear extension to a ground floor flat, extending 8m from the rear wall of the original property on the left hand side and over 9m from the line of the original building on the right hand side (adjoining our property). The proposed development extends the full width of the garden (approx., 6.8m wide) and rises over 3.5m (discrepancies on drawings on overall height) from ground level. The plans attached to the application states that the new development will have a GIA of 50.6sqm. Given that the existing property has an approx. GIA of 58sqm, the proposed development will increase the footprint by almost 100% and add a volume of 194 cubic meters. The sheer scale, footprint and proportion of the development is not subordinate to the building being extended or neighbouring properties.</p> <p>The proposed development appears to suggest the use of the 'boundary' as the outer leaf of the development's wall adjoining our garden, however there is currently no wall the full length of the boundary. This is therefore not possible.</p> <p>In terms of extensions to neighbouring sites, No. 9 Weech Road has been extended however this has been set back from the boundary with No.10 and detached from No. 8 so is therefore less imposing. Whilst there are large rear extensions further along Weech Road, the original houses are of differing architectural design and the extensions are in proportion to those buildings. The architecture of No. 10 replicates the architectural style of No. 11. We believe the depth, height and width of the proposals are not in proportion to the character of the original building and do not respect the pattern and rhythm of the neighbouring sites. This unfortunately is not clear on the plans attached to the application as they do not show the proposal in context with its surroundings and therefore omits to show the impact it would have.</p> <p>2. Amenity CPG adopted 15 January 2021 states that 'Developments should ensure that the proximity, size or cumulative effect of any structures avoids having an overbearing and/or dominating effect that is detrimental to the enjoyment of their properties by adjoining residential occupiers.' It also states that the development should 'Consider if the extension projection would not cause sense of enclosure to the adjacent occupiers' and 'Retain the open character of existing natural landscaping and garden amenity, including that of neighbouring properties, proportionate to that of the surrounding area'</p> <p>The existing boundary wall between No. 10 and No.11 is 2.35m brick wall from ground level extending 3.2m towards the rear boundary (Planning Approval 2009/5347/P). Beyond the brick wall there is a timber fence, 1.63m in height with large open trellis above. Drawing No. PR02 indicates an overall height for the proposed development of 3.58m. This would increase the height of the boundary wall by 1.2m at the rear of the house, further increasing to 1.9m within the garden area. This will undoubtedly create an enclosed feeling within our garden and as you enter the garden from the property particularly as the imposing wall will extend 8m at this height. We will email a drawing illustrating the elevation from No.11 looking towards the boundary with the proposed development to illustrate the impact this proposal will have on our garden.</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:****Comment:** **Response:**

3. Amenity CPG adopted 15 January 2021 states, 'The Council expects applicants to consider the impact of development schemes on daylight and sunlight levels. Where appropriate a daylight and sunlight assessment should be submitted which should follow the guidance in the BRE's Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight: A guide to good practice. The 45 degree and 25 degree tests cited in the BRE guidance should be used to assess ('screen') whether a sunlight and daylight report is required.'

We will email a drawing which clearly illustrates using the 45 degree test that daylight and sunlight into our property will be affected by the proposed development. A further appropriate assessment is required at the very least.

The NPPF states as a core planning principle (paragraph 17) that planning should "always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings". It also states (56) that "good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people". We have shown that the proposed development falls short on several areas in providing these principles. We have enjoyed our garden amenities for over 50 years and we believe that the proposed development would adversely affect our quality of space and light. We strongly request that your department considers our findings and refuses the proposed development.
