

Please find attached objection to planning application Case Ref: HGY/2026/0204, which includes a drawing of the rear of No.s 37 and 39, which we were unable to include in the comments box earlier.

We object to the proposed application Case Ref: HGY/2026/0204 on the grounds that it will result in a loss of privacy, have an overbearing impact on our property and result in a loss of light. We are also concerned about rainwater run-off onto our property.

Loss of privacy and light

No.s 37 and 39 are terraced houses. No.s 37 and 39 meet at the rear in an unusual way (drawing attached). The rear of no. 37 is two story, with a lean-to roof, which sits at right angles to the back wall of no. 37 (with a side return against no. 35). The highest point of the supporting wall to no. 37's lean-to meets no. 39. However, unlike other local terrace houses with this format at the rear, the highest point of the lean-to is not met on the side of no. 39 with a lean-to of equal height. Instead, running alongside no. 37's supporting wall at no. 39 is a flat roof ground floor single story galley kitchen. Running alongside the galley kitchen at no. 39 is a patio area.

No. 37 is to the North of No. 39, so increasing the height of the party wall will increase the amount of shadow cast on no. 39 property and garden. The present wall already considerably impacts the shadow and light across the adjacent side of the garden and into the house. Increasing the height of the wall would make this worse.

The applicant has not provided an elevational drawing of the South side of the party wall. The wall at the moment is overbearing from the garden of no. 39 and parts of the rear of the house. Raising it will increase that. It's finish is unattractive now. We do not know what the proposals are for dealing with it because of the lack of an elevational drawing.

The drawings do not show no. 39, which would be affected by the development. They should show plans and a rear elevation to make it easier to assess the effect the development might have on no. 39. As noted above, the proposed development is likely to have a significant effect on no.39 both because it would overlook no.39 and restrict light.

The former issue is aggravated by the proposal to install an outside terrace. As illustrated in the section B-B, from the proposed terrace, overlooking of no. 39 property would be likely, both into the bathrooms, back rooms and the garden. This is contrary to what is said at point 6 of the applicant's Design and Access Statement.

We have noted that few loft extensions in our locality extend over the rear lean-to and those that do (even where the lean-to is met with a lean-to of equivalent height) extend over the lean-to minimally or to a maximum of 50 per cent of the length of the lean-to from the rear wall. No. 35 is an example where the extension beyond the back wall of the house along the lean-to is minimal.

The houses on the opposite side of Clyde Road to no.s 37 and 39 (the side incorporating no.s 2, 4, 6 etc) have a similar layout to no 37. The dormers on that side of the road do not extend from the main back wall of the house beyond 50 per cent of the lower rear lean-to roof. Furthermore, where there is a dormer (albeit not the length of the one proposed at no. 37) the neighbour has the benefit of the space afforded by their own lean-to roof or the side return on the side of the neighbours dormer.

Rainwater run-off

Recent heavier rain causes rainwater to cascade off dormers and rear roofs. We are concerned that the proposed dormer will result in excess rainwater onto No. 39's adjacent rear ground floor single story flat roof which would likely cause damage.

