

Amber Willard

From: Geoff Baxter
Sent: 24 February
To: Amber Willard
Cc: Cllr. Hugh Co
Subject: AW/3/21/HH

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Ms Willard

The above application is currently under consideration and will be debated by the Planning Committee on March 3.

The focus of residents many objections have centred on the rear roof box extension and our comments have been duly recorded. If this is eventually granted consent I would like to highlight two areas where the need for 'conditions' are attached to the outcome when this is determined.

Firstly it is stated in the Architects planning statement and drawings that obscure glazing will be used to a height of 1.7m from floor level. In normal situations this may be acceptable to provide screening, however in this case it is felt that is not the case. It will be essential to lower floor levels in order to create sufficient height in the loft conversion due to the particularly shallow roof pitch. The consequence of this would result in the proposed distance of 1.7m being measured from a much lower floor level. This would result in a much smaller area of glazing being obscured, thereby not providing the level of screening expected. In order for there to be no misinterpretation it is essential that 'all' glazing on this level needs to be fully obscure. Alternatively the area of glazed screening needs to be measured from the window base, and not as proposed the floor level for the reasons stated.

One other area of concern is the reconfiguration of first floor rear facing rooms. I am aware that internal changes normally fall outside of planning criteria, however in this case these changes form part of the overall planning submission for this property. Our concern is that a further first floor window will be created on the rear as part of these changes. This will be as a result in two bathrooms being created.

While we have no objection to their use, we hope you share our view that a 'condition' of these two rooms is that glazing should also be obscure, which is generally the norm for such rooms. I state this as the existing bathroom glazing is not obscure and if therefore could be a problem. If this is permitted as part of this application.

I am aware the matter of 'conditions' fall outside of planning law and are based on judgements that can be attached to applications in the decision making process in order to less the impact on neighbouring properties.

I hope you will consider these requests as being reasonable and is something that can be raised and discussed at the forthcoming committee meeting.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards

Geoff Baxter

Sent from my iPhone