

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2478/P	Conall Macfarlane	26/07/2021 17:02:58	OBJ	<p>Whilst on initial inspection the plans for this development of the rear of 18a Ainger Road seem innocuous enough, there are very serious issues of loss of natural light and privacy as far as our house (17 Ainger Road) is concerned. One of the most important aspects when considering this proposal is the relative positions of the two houses and the limitations imposed by both sides of the terraced houses in Chamberlain Street which are east and south of the back of our house. One of the major sources of light for us is when the sun has moved south past the shadow casting extension of No.8 Chamberlain Street and past the shadow cast by the very tall silver birch tree in the garden of 18a Ainger Road. In summer this is generally from around 3pm to about 4.30pm. A further aspect that needs to be taken into consideration is that No. 17 is on the downhill side of 18 and therefore approximately 16" (40cm) lower. The practical effect of the site topography in relation to No. 17 is that it increases the sensitivity of the application site whereby any additional height and mass is likely to lead to noticeable losses of daylight and sunlight to a number of the main habitable rooms. There is also the effect of taking the maximum height of the existing conservatory roof of No.18a and moving it from its present position to the extreme edge of the party wall, presenting us with an overbearing face of sheer brickwork. This brings me to the plans as presented: generally there appears to be a shortage of vertical measurements, so that it is impossible to discover the overall heights of the proposed structure. Plan PA203 and plan PA301 need to be carefully compared, where the existing roof line of the current conservatory has been included in red on both plans but in different places. In PA203 this is shown below the proposed new roof line; so do we understand that they intend to increase the height by that of the capping stones and parapet? We find the proposal to construct a staircase in the garden highly invasive of our privacy and much too close to the party wall. Any screening-planting will cause further loss of light to our garden which is already limited enough thanks to the scale of the silver birch tree in the garden of 18a (probably over 40 feet and certainly overtopping the height of the chimneys in Chamberlain Street). Never forgetting that our primary source of light is from the south in the short period in the afternoon; also that the room most frequented is the kitchen on the lower ground floor with french windows, where we are obliged to have artificial throughout the day all year round since the existing conservatory was built. No.18a already has a perfectly adequate internal staircase. It may be worth mentioning that when the application for a new structure on the party wall was submitted by Mr. and Mrs. Adler around 1999, we raised objections to those plans. Planning permission was only granted for a conservatory with all external walls and roof to be glass and the roof pitched in order to have the internal height, but also allow for more light on the party wall. (The roof line once built exceeded the planned measurements and we informed the planners of this infringement.) Nevertheless, we did lose light. The current proposed plan for which consent is being sought, is of a far more massive and intrusive order; the proposed new flat roof to be the height (or higher) than the apex of the present conservatory and extending from the party wall of No. 17 to the party wall of No. 19.</p> <p>We would welcome an inspection of the site and also a technical assessment of the loss of privacy and daylight/sunlight in order to be able to form a proper judgement of the planning balance associated with this application under consideration.</p>