

28th September 2022

Dear Mr Toby Williams,

Having looked at the revised plans submitted on 21st September, it does not appear that our original objection has been addressed.

We object to the Proposed Revision A plans dated 21st of September 2022 based on two counts:

1. loss of privacy and reduction in amenity of 146's garden due to the proximity and design of the side window of the proposed kitchen extension
2. unacceptable overshadowing due to the newly introduced Pergola/ structure at the juncture with the neighbouring garden of 146

1. Continued objection to the easterly facing window

According to the newly submitted plans, the full height window facing in an easterly direction straight towards 146 Cranley Gardens has not changed or been revised in any way:

- The concerns included in our previous objection have not been mitigated by the proposed Pergola/ structure and still stand
- Given the upward slope of ground levels to the west between 144 and 146, the newly proposed Pergola/ structure still allows for a clear line of sight into 146's garden for anyone of average height
- The proposed timber Pergola/ structure does not address the loss of privacy as it is a temporary structure which could be easily removed at any point by the current, or future owners of 144

2. Objection to the Pergola / structure

According to the submitted plans, the new Pergola/ structure at the juncture with 146 would extend 6m in length from the back of 144's existing utility room (7.9m from the back of the main house) along the edge of their garden, adjacent to the garden of 146, and would be constructed at over 3m tall from 144's existing ground level. We object to this development due to a detrimental loss of sunlight and overshadowing which will reduce the amenity of 146's garden:

- The proposed structure would be c.1.3m above the existing fence line
- The measurements on the plans do not consider the downward slope of ground levels for 146 to the north
- The proposed structure would stand at 3.1m from 144's ground level at its furthest point (according to submitted plans) and over c.3.2m high above 146's garden level
- The mass and scale of this structure does not consider the existing context, nor its potential impact

In addition, as mentioned above, this new structure provides no long-term solution to the original objection of a loss of privacy from the proposed window which will be 3.5m from 144's ground level.

In relation to objection 1, we request that the design of the eastly side of the proposed extension, specifically the window, is changed to provide a permanent solution with the appropriate amount of privacy given its proximity to the garden of 146 and its elevated ground position. We ask that as part of the planning requirements the window is changed to one of the following options:

- Removed entirely from the plans
- Required to be made significantly smaller to become an opaque slit window, similar to the one proposed on the westerly side. We would request this window starts no lower than 2m from the proposed inside ground level of 144's proposed kitchen extension
- Required to be made of sandblasted glass in its entirety and not transparent

In relation to objection 2, we request that the pergola / structure is changed to allow the appropriate amount of sunlight and reduce the overshadowing. We request as part of the planning requirements the newly proposed pergola/ structure is:

- Removed entirely from the plans
- Required to be no higher than 2.0m from existing ground levels

While we appreciate the following statement is not a planning issue, we would like it noted as public record that the drawings appended in the proposed plans to the council are incorrectly drawn in relation to the where the fence sits between 144 and 146's properties. Although the fence is not shown on the plans the easterly edge of the proposed patio, steps and Pergola / structure would extend past the existing fence into 146's garden. At no time now or in the future should these be used to define or justify property boundaries. We understand that planning is subject to legal right and insist that this is a condition of any planning approval.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Kind regards,

Nick and Clara Hermann