

Dear Mark,

I would like to object to planning application HGY/2026/0580, which I believe would significantly impact my living conditions, neighbouring amenity more generally, and is not of an appropriate design within the Noel Park Conservation Area.

Firstly, I wish to make clear that I have no objection to the principle of a rear extension and sympathise with the desire to increase the living space in what are relatively small houses.

However, I believe that amends should be secured to reduce the scale of the proposals and to achieve a higher design quality. Policy DMD1 of the Development Management DPD sets out that development proposals should address feedback from local consultation. In light of this, I very much hope my views are taken into account.

Relevant Planning History

I note the previous planning permission on the site (ref: HGY/2016/3560), which has now lapsed. This was originally for a 5.4m rear extension. At the time, officers considered that the proposal was too large and would have an unacceptable impact on neighbours as well as the character of the property. As a result, amends were secured and the extension was reduced to 4.05m in depth.

The current proposal would be 7m in depth. This is 3m larger than the previously approved scheme, which was reduced to limit impact on neighbouring amenity. **There are no new material considerations which would suggest a larger extension is now appropriate.** I consider that an extension to infill the outrigger would be appropriate, but that anything greater would be materially harmful. I therefore respectfully request that an amendment should be secured to this effect.

Objection to the depth and scale of the proposal

Policy

Policy DM12 of the Development Management DPD refers specifically to Residential Extensions. It sets out that extensions will be required to be of a high, site specific and sensitive design quality. They should complement the form, setting, period, architectural characteristics, detailing of the original buildings, including external features such as chimneys, and porches. High quality matching or complementary materials should be used appropriately and sensitively in relation to the context.

The supporting text of this policy (para 3.14) sets out that extensions to residential buildings should be subordinate in scale to the original building. New development should not undermine existing uniformity of the building or terrace. Further, they should not over balance or dominate existing features important to the building. **Paragraph 3.15 sets out that the depth of rear extensions should be such that the resulting footprint is subordinate to the main house and does not have a negative impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties.**

Policy D13 of the Draft Local Plan echoes these requirements and specifically sets out that proposed extensions should be subordinate to the existing building and must not overdevelop the site. The amenity of the occupiers of adjacent properties should not be unacceptably prejudiced with harm to neighbouring residents minimised including to loss of daylight/sunlight, loss of outlook or by creating an unacceptable sense of enclosure. Further, extensions should

not harm the character and amenity of private spaces, including rear gardens, and should not harm existing natural habitats or trees.

Subservience

The original depth of the houses on Morley Avenue is 7m. The proposed development would double this to 14m. This is in no way subordinate to the original property and fails to respect the form of the original building. This is clearly at odds with the requirements of planning policy.

Sense of Enclosure, Overbearing and Loss of Light – To House

From both my property, and from number 176, the proposal would create a sense of enclosure and overbearing, whilst also reducing the outlook of the property. The proposal would be highly visible from my kitchen, which currently benefits from outlook of surrounding trees and a sense of openness over surrounding plots. Further, the depth of the proposal would result in loss of light, particularly in the afternoon and evening.

Sense of Enclosure, Overbearing and Loss of Light – To Garden

The sense of overbearing would be felt acutely in the garden. The gardens of Morley Avenue are relatively shallow in depth. The proposal would reduce the depth of the garden on the application site from over 11m to less than 4m. As a neighbour, this would mean that the majority of my garden would suffer the overbearing impact of an extension along a significant proportion of its length. Within a larger plot, where the homes are wider and the gardens larger, such an extension may be appropriate. However, in the context of these small, narrow houses, with small, narrow gardens, it is excessive and materially harmful to neighbouring amenity.

Overdevelopment of Plot – Insufficient Garden Space Retained

In addition to the neighbouring amenity impact, I note the property sits within a designated Family Housing Protection Zone. I would question whether leaving such a small garden behind leaves an appropriate level of amenity space for a family house. Policy clearly sets out that “where existing garden land is available the Council will seek to optimise the total amount of private amenity space and access to this space for residents”.

Concern in Relation to Height

In relation to the proposed height of the extension, it appears that it would be built up from a higher base level than the adjoining garden. As the base level of the gardens is lower than the proposed base for the extension, this would result in a sense of height greater than 3m, thereby generating a greater impact on neighbouring amenity than would be initially suggested by the stated height.

Comparison with Nearby Developments

I note that the proposal would be for a rear extension of greater depth than any other along this part of Morley or Farrant Avenue. The houses on the northern side of Farrant Avenue typically benefit from larger gardens than those on Morley Avenue. This reduces the impact of extensions as they form part of a larger plot.

Design and Failure to Respect Character of the Conservation Area

Policy and Conservation Area Design Guidance

Policy DM9 (Management of the Historic Environment) sets out that proposals for alterations and extensions to existing buildings in Conservation Areas should complement the architectural style, scale, proportions, materials and details of the host building and should not appear overbearing or intrusive. Consideration should be given to the special character and appearance of the Conservation Area. These requirements are echoed by draft Policy HE4.

The Noel Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (CAAMP) provides the following development management design guidance in relation to rear extensions: “Where the original house has an ‘L’ shaped footprint, rear extensions should reflect the original layout and should not be built across the full width of the plot...Extensions should not usually extend more than three metres beyond the rear wall.”

Excessive Scale

The proposal extends far beyond the guidance suggested by the CAAMP and does not follow the form suggested by it. As currently proposed, the proposal fails to respect the scale or proportions of the host building. This is particularly important in the context of the Conservation Area where consideration should be given to the special character and given the policy requirement that development should not appear overbearing or intrusive.

Roof Form

The proposal includes a stepped roof, in what appears to be an attempt to reduce the clear overbearing impact on number 176. This has resulted in a discordant roof form, with three different heights, which is not in keeping with the character of the Conservation Area. A simpler roof design might be more appropriate. However, this is not possible given the excess scale of the development. A reduction in depth would enable the development of a more congruent roof form and I would be grateful if such an amend is considered further with the applicant.

Site Visit

Should you be minded to approve the development without amends, I would be grateful if you would first make a site visit to my property, to enable full consideration of the impact of the proposals on my amenity, and that of 176. I consider a site visit essential in order to properly assess the resulting enclosure, outlook and light impacts, which cannot be fully appreciated from submitted drawings alone. I would gladly facilitate your visit.

Summary

I support the principle of a rear extension. However, in their current form, I believe the proposals would have a significant impact on my living conditions and would be detrimental to the appearance and character of the Noel Park Conservation Area. They would also leave only a very small rear garden space for the host property, which would not be suitable for a family sized home. All of the issues raised are symptomatic of an overdevelopment of the site and could easily be addressed through a refined design.

In the absence of such amendments, the proposal would clearly conflict with both existing and emerging planning policies, and should be refused.

I therefore respectfully request that amends are sought to reduce the scale of the proposals and improve the design quality. This would mirror the approach taken by officers on the lapsed consent granted on this site, as well as the approach taken on other extensions in the vicinity.

Thank you very much for taking the time to consider my comments.

Yours Sincerely,

A. Tayler