

From: planningcomments@highpeak.gov.uk
To: [Planning Comments \(HPBC\)](#)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access
Date: 20 October 2023 16:02:29

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

From:
6 Lonsdale Road
Barnes
Richmond upon Thames
London

SW13 9EB

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 daughter of Mrs Crummett, 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.

To date her neighbours have made no attempt to visit or discuss their application with her nor requested to visit her property to consider the potential impact.

As my mother correctly notes in her objection, this is a re-submission of a previous application with no change to the design. Option B has been suggested as an alternative but it is not the basis of this application which remains unaltered. In any event, whilst Option B is marginally less impactful it is similarly unacceptable for the same reasons.

Planning History/Living Conditions of Local People/Design and Visual Impact/Loss of Privacy:

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 resulting 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! It appears that the owners of No26 Wood Gardens, who I believe purchased their property in the last couple of years, have simply looked at the plot and produced a design for the largest and therefore most economically beneficial extension they can fit onto what is essentially the existing footprint.

The planning officers previous reasoning was accurate. In this, subsequent, submission the amendments to the proposal amount to a supporting statement that essentially says ;the planning officer is wrong;. The planning officer is not wrong! The proposal by reason of its height, scale and positioning, along with its orientation and juxtaposition to No.27 Wood Gardens, would resulting an unacceptable relationship with my mother;s property. The proposed relationship would 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 my mother.

The re-submission relies on a computer simulation of light loss to my mother's 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.

This analysis considers only direct shadow and not the looming presence of scale or indeed the general loss of light the increased dimensions would cause. My mother often sits in her garden, at the bottom, which is the sunniest spot, and enjoys views past No26 to trees and hills. This would all disappear!

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

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. Whilst Option B is marginally less impactful, it remains 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.

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 a self serving and adversarial approach to the planning application process. Essentially the logic is that you approved it for these people so it must be fine for me! It would be perfectly possible to build a large extension on one house with no impact on the neighbours whilst the impact on another property could be enormous. This is the case with this application.

I urge you to reject this application once again on the same grounds. This application is abusive and unneighbourly. As my mother says, she is perfectly happy to discuss a potential extension with her neighbours provided that it is of a size and scale that does not result in a detrimental impact on the amenities enjoyed by her property, and should they make such a proposal she would not object to it. The approach taken thus far is quite the opposite.

Judith Behan

6 Lonsdale Road

Barnes

London

SW13 9EB

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>
