

ITEM NUMBER: 5h

20/00758/FHA	Two storey side and single storey rear extensions	
Site Address:	24 Finch Road Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3LH	
Applicant/Agent:	Anneke Laux / Chris Hlaing	
Case Officer:	Natasha Vernal	
Parish/Ward:	Berkhamsted Town Council	Berkhamsted West
Referral to Committee:	Contrary view of Berkhamsted Town Council	

1. RECOMMENDATION

1.1 That planning permission be granted with conditions.

2. SUMMARY

2.1 The principle of residential development in this location is acceptable. The proposed two storey side extension with a single storey rear extension and a single storey front extension will integrate with the existing dwelling and surrounding area by virtue of its sympathetic design and scale. Whilst visible from the surrounding area, the proposal will not detrimentally impact upon the living conditions of surrounding properties nor will it impact upon local parking provision.

2.2 The proposal is therefore in accordance with Saved Appendices 3 and 5 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004), Policies CS4, CS10, CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013), the NPPF (2019) and the Durrants (BCA16) Residential Character Appraisal Supplementary Planning Guidance (2004).

3. SITE DESCRIPTION

3.1 The site is occupied by a two storey detached dwelling located on the south side of Finch Road in Berkhamsted. The site is predominately residential in character. Finch Road is characterised by detached dwellings but hosts a variety of styles, designs and finishes such that there are no common design features or uniformity to the street scene.

4. PROPOSAL

4.1 The proposal seeks full householder planning permission for the construction of a two storey side extension with a single storey rear extension and a single storey front extension.

4.2. The original plans 3068.02.01 (existing and proposed elevations) and 3068.02.01 (existing and proposed floor plans) consisted of a flat roof first floor rear extension that extended approximately 3.6 metres from the rear elevation and featured timber cladding across the north-west flank elevation. Although the first floor rear extension would not be visible from the public realm, it was considered to be out of keeping with the existing dwelling and the surrounding area when viewed along the adjoining neighbouring properties at Nos. 20, 22, 26 and 28 rear elevations. Furthermore, the depth of the first floor rear extension was considered to be visually overbearing when viewed from the neighbouring property at No.22's rear garden. Due to the orientation of the application site, the proposed first floor rear extension would likely cause overshadowing to the neighbouring property at No.22 in the morning. Therefore, the agent was advised to set the first floor rear extension back to 3 metres to reduce impacts on loss of sunlight/daylight. The timber cladding located to the north-west flank elevation of the subject property was considered to be unduly prominent and not in uniform with the adjacent neighbouring property at No.22's side elevation and therefore was considered to have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding environment. These plans have now been superseded.

4.3 The agent was advised by the case officer to make amendments to the original scheme, amended plans was received on 4th May 2020. The amended scheme 3068.02.03 and 3068.04.03 show a pitched roof first floor rear extension extending approximately 3 metres from the original rear elevation reducing the overshadowing and loss of light impacts when viewed from the neighbouring property at No.22's rear elevation. Amendments has been made to the north-west flank elevation showing render in white to the proposed two storey side extension. The plans also show a 45 degree rule from the subject property and the neighbouring property at No.22 resulting to the proposal complying with the 45 degree rule. The agent submitted further additional plans 3068.05.01 and 04820-001 received on 18th June 2020 showing a detailed site plan with a topographical survey. These additional plans further justify the proposal complying with the 45 degree rule.

5. PLANNING HISTORY

None

6. CONSTRAINTS

Parking Accessibility Zone (DBLP): 4

CIL Zone: CIL1

Parish: Berkhamsted CP

RAF Halton and Chenies Zone: Green (15.2m)

RAF Halton and Chenies Zone: RAF HALTON: DOTTED BLACK ZONE

RAF Halton and Chenies Zone: Red (10.7m)

Residential Area (Town/Village): Residential Area in Town Village (Berkhamsted)

EA Source Protection Zone: 3

EA Source Protection Zone: 2

Town: Berkhamsted

7. REPRESENTATIONS

Consultation responses

7.1 These are reproduced in full at Appendix A.

Neighbour notification/site notice responses

7.2 These are reproduced in full at Appendix B.

8. PLANNING POLICIES

Main Documents:

National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)

Dacorum Borough Core Strategy 2006-2031 (adopted September 2013)

Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1999-2011 (adopted April 2004)

Relevant Policies:

NP1 - Supporting Development

CS1 - Distribution of Development

CS4 - The Towns and Large Villages

CS10 - Quality of Settlement Design

CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design

CS12 - Quality of Site Design

CS29 - Sustainable Design and Construction

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents:

Durrants (BCA16) Residential Character Appraisal (2004)

Accessibility Zones for the Application of Car Parking Standards (2002)

Planning Obligations (2011)

Roads in Hertfordshire, Highway Design Guide 3rd Edition (2011)

Site Layout and Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice (2011)

9. CONSIDERATIONS

Main Issues

9.1 The main issues to consider are:

The policy and principle justification for the proposal;
The quality of design and impact on visual amenity;
The impact on residential amenity; and
The impact on highway safety and car parking.

Principle of Development

9.2 The application site is located in a residential area of Berkhamsted. Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS4 states that appropriate residential development is encouraged in the towns and large villages.

Quality of Design / Impact on Visual Amenity

9.3 Core Strategy (2013) Policies CS10, CS11 and CS12 highlight the importance of high quality sustainable design in improving the character and quality of an area, seeking to ensure that developments are in keeping with the surrounding area in terms of scale, mass, height and appearance. This guidance is supported by Saved Appendices 3 and 7 of the Local Plan (2004). In addition, the Durrants (BCA16) Residential Character Appraisal (2004) states that extensions should normally be subordinate in terms of scale and height to the parent building and the use of architectural features be simple, with a general lack of detailing on buildings to provide a strong design pattern characterised by red brickwork and hipped roofs.

9.4 The surrounding area is characterised by detached dwellings but hosts a variety of styles and designs, many of which show evidence of extension / alteration.

9.5 The existing garage would be demolished. The proposal seeks the erection of a two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension with a single storey front porch extension. The proposal would comprise a pitched roof to the two storey side extension and a flat roof to the rear extension and front porch. It is noted that properties within the street scene such as Nos.7, 17, 19, 21, 26 and 35 benefit from two storey side extensions.

9.6 The proposed two storey side extension would extend approximately 2.9 metres from the existing side elevation of the house, a length of 10.6 metres and a height of 7.7 metres. The proposed two storey side extension would extend approximately 0.4 metres from the front elevation and 3 metres from the rear elevation creating a first floor rear extension. The proposed two storey side extension would be set below the original roof ridge by approximately 0.08 metres. The proposed first floor rear extension would be pitched roof and would extend approximately 3 metres from the rear elevation, a width of 4.4 metres and a height of 3.7 metres measured from the ridge board to the base of the first floor rear extension. The proposed first floor rear extension would be set below the original roof ridge by approximately 2.2 metres.

9.7 The Durrants (BCA16) Residential Character Appraisal states that spacing within the medium range (2 m to 5 m) should be maintained. The proposed two storey side extension would be sited approximately 1.4 metres from the north-west boundary and the neighbouring property at No.22 would be sited approximately 0.6 metres from the common boundary resulting in a 2 metres separation distance between the two properties. It is considered that there would be adequate separation between the subject property and the neighbouring property at No.22 to avoid a terraced effect in the street scene. There is also adequate space on the eastern side of the existing dwelling and the neighbouring property at No.26 to avoid it appearing cramped within the street scene. Therefore the proposed two storey side extension complies with the Durrants (BCA16) Residential Character Appraisal (2004).

9.8 The proposed single storey rear extension would extend approximately 3.8 metres from the rear elevation, have a width of 9.4 metres and a height of 2.8 metres. One roof light would be inserted within the proposed flat roof.

9.9 The proposed single storey front extension would extend approximately 1.2 metres from the principal elevation, a width of 3.2 metres and a height of 2.8 metres. Alterations to fenestration is proposed to the existing dwelling with external works to the front elevation involving the infilling of the existing front door and window with brickwork to match the existing dwelling and the insertion of a window to the ground floor front elevation.

9.10 The proposed front and west flank elevation would be rendered at first floor to match the existing dwelling. The proposed rear elevation would feature timber cladding in black. A parapet wall is proposed on the ground floor west flank elevation and would have facing brickwork to match the existing dwelling and the surrounding environment.

9.11 It is noted that the proposal introduces contemporary materials at the rear elevation, however these materials would not be visible from the public realm and therefore it is not considered to have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling or the surrounding area.

9.12 Although some elements of the proposed development would be visible from the public realm, the proposal would be set back from the public highway by approximately 7 metres and therefore the proposal would be less prominent when viewed along Finch Road. Furthermore, the proposal is considered to harmonise with the existing dwelling and the surrounding street scene as the proposed two storey side extension and front porch allows visual reading of the original front elevation and therefore it is not considered to result in a massing that would be unduly prominent or out of keeping within the character and appearance of the existing dwelling or the surrounding area.

9.13 It is considered that the design, layout and scale of the proposed development respects that of the existing and surrounding dwellings. The architectural style is sympathetic to the surrounding area and the proposal will not have a detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the area. The proposal therefore complies with Saved Appendices 3 and 7 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004), Policies CS10, CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) and the NPPF (2019).

Impact on Residential Amenity

9.14 The NPPF outlines the importance of planning in securing good standards of amenity for existing and future occupiers of land and buildings. Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan and Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy, seek to ensure that new development does not result in detrimental impact upon the neighbouring properties and their amenity space.

9.15 The neighbouring property at No.26 benefit from a two storey side and single storey front extension and pitched roof over existing rear extension granted under LPA ref. 4/00331/11/FHA.

9.16 The proposed front extension would extend beyond the neighbouring property at No.26's principal elevation by approximately 1.2 metres. However the proposed extension would be on the opposite side of the existing dwelling and would be sited approximately 7.5 metres from the east boundary. The proposed two storey side extension and single storey rear extension would not project beyond No.26's rear elevation. The proposed first floor extension would be sited approximately 5.8 metres from the east boundary and the proposed single storey rear extension would be sited approximately 0.7 metres from the east boundary. Due to the position of No.26, the orientation is favourable and therefore this neighbour would experience no loss of sunlight. Furthermore, due to the orientation being favourable to No.26 and the absence of side fenestration towards No.26 there are no concerns in terms of overlooking, loss of light or overshadowing.

9.17 It is noted that formal objections have been received from neighbouring property at No.22. The neighbouring property at No.22 has objected on the grounds of the proposed development causing potential overshadowing, loss of light and not in keeping with the surrounding area. However following the neighbour objection, the agent confirmed the accuracy of the plans and submitted an amendment plan adding the correct scale bars to clarify the correct measurements as well as indicating the distance from the middle of No. 22's patio doors to the fence, and from the fence to the line of the proposed extension. A topographical survey was submitted which shows the levels across the site. Furthermore, the applicant's agent had signed a declaration stating that, to the best of their knowledge, the facts stated are true and accurate.

9.18 Although the proposed front extension would project beyond the neighbouring property at No.22's principal elevation, the proposed extension would be on the ground floor and would be sited approximately 1.7 metres from the north-west boundary. The proposed two storey side extension and single storey rear extension would extend beyond the neighbouring property at No.22's rear elevation by approximately 3.8 metres at ground floor level and 3 metres at first floor level. Whilst the proposed first floor rear extension may result to some loss of light from No.22's first floor rear elevation, the proposed development would not breach the 45 degree rule and would be sited approximately 1.4 metres from the north-west boundary. Furthermore, the scheme has been reduced in scale during the course of the application in order to address some of the neighbour's concerns. Overall the proposed extensions would not cause a significant loss of sunlight to No.22 due to the separation distance and absence of side fenestration there are no concerns in respect of visual intrusion or loss of privacy.

9.19 The proposed first floor extension may result in overlooking towards the rear elevations of neighbouring property at Nos 14 and 16 (Orchards Close). However the proposed first floor rear extension would be sited approximately 24 metres from Nos. 14 and 16 and therefore there are no concerns regarding overlooking.

9.20 Taking the above into account, it is considered that the proposal will be acceptable with respect to the impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013), Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan (2004) and the NPPF (2019).

Impact on Highway Safety and Parking

9.21 Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) seeks to ensure developments have sufficient parking provision. Paragraph 105 of the NPPF (2019) states that when setting local parking standards authorities should take into account the accessibility of the development, the type, mix and use of the development, availability of public transport; local car ownership levels and the overall need to reduce the use of high emission vehicles. Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy (2013) and Saved Policies 57, 58 and Appendix 5 of the Local Plan (2004) promote an assessment based upon maximum parking standards.

9.22 The existing dwelling comprises three bedrooms, the maximum parking requirement for which is two off-street parking spaces, according to Saved Appendix 5. As a result of the proposed development there would be five bedrooms. The existing garage would be demolished and therefore the proposal would result in the loss of one internal parking space. However, the loss of the parking space will not affect the local parking capacity as this five bedroomed detached dwelling has a substantial area of hardstanding located to the frontage of the subject property that can accommodate at least two vehicles. The block plan on drawing "3068.02.03" show that the existing driveway would be extended to accommodate at least three vehicles. However a landscaping condition requiring the hardstanding materials within the site will be imposed to ensure no adverse impact on the safety or operation of Finch Road. In addition, there are local public transport routes situated in close proximity to the application site.

9.23 It is considered that the proposed development will not have a detrimental impact on local parking provision, nor will it have a severe impact to the safety and operation of the adjacent highway. Thus, the proposal meets the requirements of Policy CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) and Saved Appendix 5 of the Local Plan (2004).

Berkhamsted Town Council Objection

9.24 Berkhamsted Town Council has objected on the grounds of the scale, mass and bulk of the first-floor extension being overbearing and would adversely impact the amenity of the neighbour at number 22. The objector's photos show the disparity between the actual dimensions and those in the application.

9.25 The proposed first floor rear extension is considered to be modest in scale. The width of the first floor allows visual reading of the original rear elevation and therefore it is not considered to result in a massing that would be unduly prominent or out of keeping within the character and appearance of the existing dwelling or the surrounding area. In regards to impacts on neighbour amenity, the first floor rear extension demonstrates subservience by setting back the rear walls to 3 metres. Furthermore, the proposed first floor rear extension would not breach the 45 degree rule and therefore it is not considered that the proposal would read as a visually intrusive form of development when viewed from the neighbouring property at No.22's rear elevation. In terms of the comments regarding the objector's photo, the case officer has no reason to believe that the scaled drawings submitted as part of the application are inaccurate; these concerns have been addressed earlier in the report.

Response to Neighbour Comments

9.26 The neighbouring property at No.22 has objected on the grounds of the proposed development causing potential overshadowing, loss of light and not in keeping with the surrounding area. These points have been addressed in the impact on residential amenity assessment.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

9.27 Policy CS35 requires all developments to make appropriate contributions towards infrastructure required to support the development. These contributions will normally extend only to the payment of CIL where applicable. The Council's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) was adopted in February 2015 and came into force on the 1st July 2015. The application is not CIL liable as it would result in less than 100 square metres of additional residential floor space.

10. CONCLUSION

10.1 The proposed development through its design, scale and finish will not adversely impact upon the visual amenity of the immediate street scene or the residential amenity of neighbouring

occupants. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Saved Appendices 3 and 5 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004), Policies CS4, CS10, CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) and the NPPF (2019).

11. RECOMMENDATION

11.1 That planning permission be granted with conditions.

Condition(s) and Reason(s):

- 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.**

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 (1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans/documents:**

- **3068.02.03**
- **3068.04.03**
- **3068.05.01**
- **04820-001**
- **Site Location Plan**

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

- 3. The development hereby permitted shall be constructed in accordance with the materials specified on the application form.**

Reason: To make sure that the appearance of the building is suitable and that it contributes to the character of the area in accordance with Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013).

- 4. No construction of the superstructure shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include:**

- **all external hard surfaces within the site;**
- **other surfacing materials;**
- **means of enclosure;**
- **soft landscape works including a planting scheme with the number, size, species and position of trees, plants and shrubs; and**
- **front garden parking arrangement.**

The planting must be carried out within one planting season of completing the development. Any tree or shrub forming part of the approved landscaping scheme which, within a period of 5 years from planting, fails to become established, becomes seriously damaged or diseased, dies or for any reason is removed shall be replaced in the next planting season by a tree or shrub of a similar species, size and maturity.

Reason: To improve the appearance of the development and its contribution to biodiversity and the local environment, as required by saved Policy 99 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (2004) and Policy CS12 (e) of the Dacorum Borough Council Core Strategy (2013).

Informatives:

1. Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. Discussion with the applicant to seek an acceptable solution was not necessary in this instance. The Council has therefore acted pro-actively in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraph 38) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2015.

APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Consultee	Comments
Berkhamsted Town Council	<p>Objection to amended scheme dated on 3rd June 2020.</p> <p>The scale, mass and bulk of the first-floor extension is overbearing and would adversely impact the amenity of the neighbour at number 22. The objector's photos show the disparity between the actual dimensions and those in the application.</p> <p>CS12</p>
Berkhamsted Town Council	<p>Objection to the original scheme dated on 15th April 2020.</p> <p>Although the front porch is acceptable, the proposed scale of the rear and second storey extensions would result in an overbearing development which would cause loss of amenity to the adjacent neighbour.</p> <p>CS12</p>

APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

Number of Neighbour Comments

Neighbour Consultations	Contributors	Neutral	Objections	Support
8	1	0	0	0

Neighbour Responses

Address	Comments
<p>22 Finch Road Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3LH</p>	<p>Objection to the original scheme dated on 8th April 2020.</p> <p>I write in regards to the above planning application. I firstly like to highlight a discrepancy in the proposal letter to the planning view: the proposal letter states a "two storey side and single storey rear extension", however in 3068.04.01 existing and proposed elevations (View F) proposed north-west (flank elevation) states "two storey rear extension vertical timber cladding with horizontal joint detail." This is misleading to those who may wish to view and respond to the planning application unless they view the plans in detail online.</p> <p>Also compass direction on the plans is misleading, it is NOT "N" for North but should be "S" for South and the view F above should read "south-west" (flank)...</p> <p>Secondly, I wish to OBJECT strongly to the two storey rear extension as indicated on the plan (View F), for the below reasons.</p> <p>1. Loss of light and overshadowing A double storey rear extension would lead to an unacceptable loss of light and overshadowing for 22 Finch Road. The particular concern is that the neighbouring property, 22 Finch Road, does not have an extension all the way along the back of the house (see 'F' Proposed Block Plan' on '3.68.04.01 existing and proposed plans'). Notably, there is a pond and small patio in the area (see picture 1 and 2) that will be over-shadowed and double doors to the dining room which is the main source of natural light for the room (see picture 3 and 4).</p> <p>A few further points:</p> <p>The light has been uninterrupted in this way for a period of over 30 years, I understand a right to light is acquired when there has been an uninterrupted period of 20 years.</p> <p>The orientations of both 22 and 24 Finch Road mean that the rear of each plot is South West facing, so this would significantly impact natural light when the sun rises.</p> <p>The site is on a hill, so 24 Finch Road is higher than 22 Finch Road which exasperates the situation. Whilst I appreciate that the house is in need of refurbishment, we feel that the development take unacceptable amount of light from our property, number 22 Finch Road. Please refer to the two photos attached (picture 3 and 4). I would like to request that a planning officer come to the site and inspect it from our property during the site visit to understand our concerns.</p> <p>2. Visual intrusion</p> <p>The proposed extension would be out of keeping with the design of</p>

neighbouring properties. For example, 26 Finch Road was recently developed with a single storey rear extension only (see picture 5), the proposed extension for 24 Finch Road differs as it has the addition of a double storey element to the rear extension which is not in keeping with the neighbouring properties (see picture 6) and as mentioned above this to an unacceptable loss of light to 22 Finch Road.

3. New single storey front extension/porch

The proposed extension would be out of keeping with the design and of neighbouring properties in front. The porch will extend beyond the line of sight to other houses towards the front of the grass verge (see picture 7).

Finally, please note that the objection is for the two storey rear extension, vertical timber cladding with horizontal joint detail at 24 Finch Road only and new front porch.

If this application is to be decided by councillors, please take this as notice that I request a planning officer to meet with us to inspect the site. Please let us know as soon as possible the date of a meeting.

Objection to the amended scheme dated on 26th May 2020.

Following my Letter dated 1 April 2020 on the above planning application, I write in regards to the amended plans dated 20 May 2020 which do not address our concerns and would continue to result in an overbearing development which would cause a loss of amenity to our property, as per the decision of the local parish dated 15 April 2020.

I wish to OBJECT strongly to these amended plans regarding the proposed two storey rear extension as indicated on View F, G and the front porch as indicated on View F, H in "3068.02.03 Existing and Proposed Elevations".

I would like to highlight a number of discrepancies in the amended plans:

In "3068.4.03 existing and proposed elevations" (view G):

At the rear of 22 Finch Road, adjacent to the proposed two storey rear extension, the total distance measured between the middle of the patio door to the fence is 2.95m (2.15m from middle of patio door to edge of house and

0.8m from edge of house to fence, see pic a7 for authenticity of measurement). The diagram at view G shows this distance as almost 6m.

In our opinion the distance between the fence and 24 Finch Road is also over-stated.

We understand it is not possible to show the relative height of the houses in a plan of this nature, however we would like to highlight that 24 Finch Road is slightly higher than 22 Finch Road as the site is on a

hill.

This means that the 45 degree test that is being demonstrated in the proposed plans is not being met due to the inaccurate measurements on the proposed plans. In fact in view G, taking the scale shown, the distance between the middle of the patio door and the wall of extension is 802m. The true distance is 4.4m (2.95 between the middle of the patio door to the fence and 1.45m between the fence and the wall of extension). Applying the true distance to view G, pic a8line B shows the true 450 view angle.

We are concerned about the inaccurate measurements on the plans and would welcome a planning officer to inspect the site to determine accurate measurements.

In my letter dated 1 April 2020, I highlighted the discrepancy in the proposal letter to the planning view: the proposal letter states a "two storey side and single storey rear extension", however in '3068.04.03 existing and proposed elevations' (View F) proposed north-west (flank) elevation states "first floor rear extension." This continues to be misleading to those who may wish to view and respond to the planning application unless they view the plans in detail online.

I wish to OBJECT strongly to the two storey rear extension as indicated on the plan (View F and G), for the below reasons.

1. Loss of light and overshadowing

A double storey rear extension would lead to an unacceptable loss of light and overshadowing for 22 Finch Road. The particular concern is that the neighbouring property, 22 Finch Road, does not have an extension all the way along the back of the house (see IF Proposed Block Plan' on '3068.04.03 existing and proposed plans'). Notably, there is a pond and small patio in the area that will be over-shadowed and double doors to the dining room which is the main source of natural light for the room. See pic a1 and pic a2.

A few further points

The light has been uninterrupted in this way for a period of over 30 years, I understand a right to light is acquired when there has been an uninterrupted period of 20 years.

The orientations of both 22 and 24 Finch Road mean that the rear of each plot is South West facing, so this would significantly impact natural light when the sun rises.

The site is on a hill, so 24 Finch Road is higher than 22 Finch Road which exasperates the situation.

The measurements on the amended plans significantly overstate the distance between 22 and 24 Finch Road. This clear inaccuracy in the plan creates the misleading impression that loss of light would be minimal with reference to a 45 degree test (as referred to above and referenced in View F of

the amended plans and view G of the amended elevations).

Whilst I appreciate that the site at 24 Finch Road is in need of refurbishment, we feel that the development takes an unacceptable amount of light from our property, number 22 Finch Road.

Please refer to the photos attached.

2. Visual intrusion

The proposed extension would be out of keeping with the design of neighbouring properties. The house at 26 Finch Road (see pic a3), for example, was recently developed with a single storey rear extension only. The proposed extension for 24 Finch Road is materially different as it has the addition of a double storey element to the rear extension which is not in keeping with neighbouring properties (see pic a4) and as mentioned above this leads to an unacceptable loss of light to 22 Finch Road.

If this application is to be decided by councillors, please take this as notice that I request a planning officer to meet with us to inspect the site and take appropriate measurements as required. We would of course be happy to allow full access to a planning officer to our property at 22 Finch Road to verify the points made in this letter. Please let us know as soon as possible the date of a meeting.