
From: planningcomments@highpeak.gov.uk
Sent: 11 October 2023 09:20
To: Planning Comments (HPBC)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access

Categories:

Application Reference No. : HPK/2023/0419 Site Address: 26 Wood Gardens Hayfield Derbyshire SK22 2HQ High Peak Comments by: sylvia crummett

From:

27

Wood Gardens

Hayfield

High Peak

Hayfield

SK22 2HQ

Phone:

Email:

Submission: Objection

Comments: Re: Planning Application HPK/2023/0419 26 Wood Gardens, Hayfield. Two Storey Extension over existing garage (re-submission of HPK/2022/0533) ¿ OBJECTION

I am the owner of the directly adjoining property No27 Wood Gardens. I am writing to object to this application in the strongest possible terms on the following permitted grounds: Design and visual impact, Living conditions of local people, Planning History, Loss of privacy.

I am disabled. I made no comment on the previous application because I simply missed the correspondence. My neighbours made no attempt to visit or discuss their application with me.

To date my neighbours at No26 have still not spoken to me about this application nor requested to visit my property to consider the potential impact.

Whilst I recognise that emotions have no bearing on the planning process, in my opinion this application is abusive in the extreme.

My objection is as follows. This is a re-submission of a previous application with no change to the design. Option B has been suggested as an alternative but this is not the basis of the application which remains unaltered. Whilst Option B is marginally less impactful it is similarly unacceptable for the same reasons.

The previous application was refused on the following grounds relating to these subheadings:

"The proposed two storey side extension, by reason of its height, scale and positioning, along with its orientation and juxtaposition to No.27 Wood Gardens, would result in an unacceptable relationship with that property. The proposed relationship is considered to be un-neighbourly and would give rise to adverse loss of light to habitable rooms; overshadowing, overbearing to the property and its private amenity space; and an unacceptable loss of outlook. As such, the development would have a detrimental impact on the amenities enjoyed by residents of that property. The development proposals would therefore be contrary to Policies S1 and EQ6 of the High Peak Local Plan 2016, the High Peak Residential Design SPD (2005), and relevant paragraphs under Chapter 12 of the NPPF".

This continues to be the case! The amendments to the proposal amount to a supporting statement that essentially says 'the planning officer is wrong'. The planning officer is not wrong and given the circumstances of my health at the time of the previous application, I am very grateful for Mr Cleary's vigilance.

The re-submission relies on a computer simulation of light loss to my property which concludes that 'In summary, the analysis shows that there will be a small loss of light to the property at 27 Wood Gardens from the proposed extension of 26 Wood Gardens, but that this loss is at its most manifest as additional shading across the rear ground floor window at 27 Wood Gardens for approximately 1 hour, just before midday, in Spring and Summer. There will also be a small amount of additional shading over the rear garden at this time'.

I dispute this analysis in the strongest terms and suggest that if the consultant had visited my home rather than relying on a model to perform their analysis, my reasons would be obvious to them. The modelling analysis correctly notes that the development is on the northern side of No.26. No. 26 does cast a small shadow on my property, almost all day! The larger extension will simply increase this. The modelling conclusion is that there is only a small impact on direct sunlight for a short period in mid-summer, however the light loss is constant. No. 26 is offset to the rear of my property and this extension will deprive the rear of my property of light and much of its sunlight for much of the day.

The computer simulation is incorrect.

The computer simulation makes no attempt to consider the loss of privacy caused by the positioning of new windows close to the boundary of 26 and 27 Wood Gardens which will be significant.

Lastly, the consultant's analysis concludes 'This (light) loss is lower under proposed extension Option B'. There is no attempt to model the impact of Option B which is still a very large extension and I therefore conclude that Option B is not a serious proposal, rather an attempt to front-run a future application following refusal of this one with a more positive view of Option B.

For the record, in my view Option B is marginally less impactful, but still completely unacceptable because by reason of its height, scale and positioning, along with its orientation and juxtaposition to No.27 Wood Gardens, it would

result in an unacceptable relationship with my property, be un-neighbourly and would give rise to adverse loss of light to habitable rooms; be overshadowing, overbearing to my property and my private amenity space; and cause an unacceptable loss of outlook. As such, the development proposed by Option B would have a detrimental impact on the amenities enjoyed by my property.

Additional Planning History:

The supporting statement for this application makes reference to four applications in Wood Gardens where two storey extensions have been approved. This is indeed the case, however the development in Wood Gardens is not linear and the impact of an extension on one property cannot be extrapolated to another proposed development. Every situation in the road is unique.

In conclusion, I urge you to reject this application once again on the same grounds. Mr Cleary was correct the first time!

In my opinion this application is as abusive as it is unneighbourly. I am perfectly happy to discuss a potential extension with my neighbours provided that it is of a size and scale that does not result in a detrimental impact on the amenities enjoyed by my property. Should they make such a proposal I would not object to it.

Do you really need to print out this Email? Be green - keep it on the screen.

This email is intended for the addressee(s) only and may contain sensitive, privileged or confidential information that could be protectively marked. If you are not the addressee please do not use the information in any way. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it from your system. Thank you.

The Council may be required to disclose this email or any responses to it under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. The way in which we handle personal information is set out in our privacy notice and is available at <https://www.highpeak.gov.uk/YourData>
