

**ITEM NUMBER: 5d**

<b>23/03021/FHA</b>	<b>Two Storey Front &amp; Rear Extensions, Part Single Storey Rear &amp; Side Extensions. Existing Roof Removed &amp; Replaced with New Roof. New Rear Garden Room</b>	
<b>Site Address:</b>	<b>84 Gravel Lane, Hemel Hempstead, Hertfordshire, HP1 1SB</b>	
<b>Applicant/Agent:</b>	<b>Mr Mohamed Imam</b>	<b>Mr Richard Camp</b>
<b>Case Officer:</b>	<b>Briony Curtain</b>	
<b>Parish/Ward:</b>		<b>Boxmoor</b>
<b>Referral to Committee:</b>	<b>Ward Cllr call – concerns over impact on neighbour</b>	

**1. RECOMMENDATION**

That planning permission be GRANTED.

**2. SUMMARY**

2.1 The application site is located within residential area of Hemel Hempstead wherein the proposed development is acceptable in principle, in accordance with Policies CS1 and CS4 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013).

2.2 The overall size, scale and design of the proposed extensions are acceptable, and as amended would not result in any harm to the character or appearance of the property or wider street scene/area. Given the site circumstances, stagger of the properties and the window positions of adjacent properties, the works are not concluded to have any significant adverse impacts on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties by being visually overbearing or resulting in a loss of light or privacy.

2.3 Furthermore, it is not considered that the scheme would have an adverse impact on the road network or create significant parking stress in the area.

2.4 Given all of the above, the proposal is concluded to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework (2023), Policies CS1, CS4, CS8, CS11, CS12 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013), Saved Appendices 3 and 7 of the Local Plan (2004) and the Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (2020).

**3. SITE DESCRIPTION**

3.1 The application site is located within a residential area of Hemel Hempstead and comprises of a two storey detached dwelling.

**4. PROPOSAL**

4.1 Householder Planning permission is sought for the construction of two storey front and rear extensions, single storey side and rear extensions and a detached outbuilding within the rear garden. It is also proposed to introduce a side facing first floor window to both existing side elevations of the property.

4.2 The proposals have been amended during the course of the application. UPVC Cladding has been added to the front elevation at the centre of the gable end.

**5. PLANNING HISTORY**

Planning Applications:

23/02327/FHA - Two Storey Front & Rear Extensions, Part Single Storey Rear & Side Extensions.  
Existing Roof Removed & Replaced with New Roof. New Rear Garden Room  
WDN - 11th December 2023

Appeals: None.

## **6. CONSTRAINTS**

CIL Zone: CIL3

Parish: Hemel Hempstead Non-Parish

RAF Halton and Chenies Zone: Green (15.2m)

Residential Area (Town/Village): Residential Area in Town Village (Hemel Hempstead)

Residential Character Area: HCA8

Smoke Control Order

Parking Standards: New Zone 3

Town: Hemel Hempstead

## **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 (2023)

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

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

Relevant Policies:

Core Strategy

NP1 - Supporting Development

CS1 - Distribution of Development

CS4 - The Towns and Large Villages

CS8 – Sustainable Transport

CS10 - Quality of Settlement Design

CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design

CS12 - Quality of Site Design

CS29 - Sustainable Design and Construction

### Local Plan

Appendix 3 – Layout and Design of Residential Areas

Appendix 7 – Small-scale House Extensions

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents:

Accessibility Zones for the Application of Car Parking Standards (2020)

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 (2022)

## **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 situated within a designated residential area of the town of Hemel Hempstead. Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy (2013) guides new development towards Hemel Hempstead, stating that this area of the Borough will be the focus for new jobs, homes and development. Furthermore, Policy CS4 of the Core Strategy (2013) states that residential development is acceptable in designated residential areas.

Given the above policies, the proposal for the construction of extensions to an existing residential dwelling in this location is acceptable in principle in accordance with the above policies subject to a detailed assessment of its impact.

### Quality of Design / Impact on Visual Amenity

9.3 Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework emphasises the importance of good design in context and, in particular, paragraph 139 states that development which is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents. Dacorum's Core Strategy Policies CS11 (Quality of Neighbourhood Design) and CS12 (Quality of Site Design) state that development within settlements and neighbourhoods should preserve attractive streetscapes; integrate with the streetscape character and respect adjoining properties in terms of scale, height, bulk and materials.

9.4 It is noted that there are a range of dwelling types and styles along Gravel Lane such that there is variety in the street scene, however it should be noted that gabled roofs are a characteristic feature (it was originally proposed to introduce a hipped roof but concerns were raised). There is also a variety of materials exhibited in the immediate vicinity including brickwork, various forms and colours of cladding and tile-hanging to the front elevations of properties within the area. There is no formal build line, the properties are staggered, in some cases significantly so.

9.5 Despite extending to the front the proposal projects no further than the existing single storey garage and in this respect the existing staggered street pattern is respected and the extension would not appear overly dominant in the street scene. The proposed extensions will significantly alter the overall appearance of the dwelling, compared to the existing and would result in the creation of a large single gable to the front elevation, which would be wider than most in the area but this is not concluded to result in any visual harm. Given its scale and the fact it was all to be brick, concern was initially expressed that the resulting dwelling may appear slightly at odds with the street scene. To

break up the mass and bulk, and to better relate to existing examples in the street scene, UPVC cladding has been added to the front elevation. As amended, the resulting building is now considered to successfully integrate into the streetscape to comply with Policies CS11 and CS12.

9.6 The proposed rear extensions, given their siting would not be visible from the public domain and would not therefore have an impact on the character or appearance of this part of the street scene. The single storey side elements would be publically visible, but due to their slightly set back position, single storey nature and simple lean to roof design, they would appear subservient and are considered to be appropriate in terms of design, bulk, scale and use of materials. They would extend very close to the common boundary with No. 82 but given the stagger in the properties and the single storey height, would not appear unduly cramped or result in a terracing effect.

9.7 The outbuilding is single storey and sited to the very end of the garden such that it would not be visible from public vantage points and again would therefore not affect the character or appearance of the wider street scene. In any event, it is modest in size and is simple in its design with sympathetic materials such that it would harmonise well in its context. There are similar structures in the rear gardens of adjacent properties such that it would not appear incongruous and, moreover, an outbuilding of slightly lower height but otherwise identical design and form would not require consent. This is a material consideration that must be given weight.

9.8 It is concluded that the proposals respect the existing dwelling house and the character and appearance of the surrounding area, and as such comply with Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy and Saved Appendix 7 of the Local Plan.

#### Impact on Residential Amenity

9.9 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 (2004) and Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013), seek to ensure that new development does not result in detrimental impact upon neighbouring properties and their amenity space. Thus, the proposal should be designed to reduce any impact on neighbouring properties by way visual intrusion, loss of light and privacy.

#### *Impact on No. 86 Gravel Lane*

9.10 No. 86 is located to the south of the application site and given the staggered street scene is set significantly forward of No. 84. The two storey front extension and main roof alterations proposed would remain set back behind No. 86 and sited alongside/aligned with the existing side elevation such that any impact would be minimal. There is a side facing first floor window in the northern side elevation of No 86 but this serves a non-habitable room (bathroom) and is fitted with obscured glazing. Any loss of light to this non-habitable room would not significantly affect the overall living conditions or residential amenity of No. 86 and as such have been given very little weight. The BRE guidance does not take into account any loss of light to non-habitable rooms.. The same would apply to the non-habitable utility window at ground floor level. The front extension would not be visible from the nearest habitable front facing window of No. 86's bedroom window as it set behind it and as such there would be no harm to light, or aspect to this room.

9.11 To the rear, nearest to the proposed extension No. 86 features a kitchen window at ground floor level and a bedroom window at first floor level. The two storey rear extension would project further to the rear than No. 86 but not excessively so (just over 3m) and importantly there would be no breach a 45 degree line in plan form taken from the centre point of either the kitchen or the bedroom window above. Given there is no breach in plan and having regard for the orientation (the application site is to the north) in accordance with the BRE guidance an acceptable amount of light and open aspect will continue to reach the kitchen area and bedroom of No. 86. It should also be noted that having viewed the plans submitted in respect of the extensions for No. 86, the kitchen is noted as being open plan with the dining area and is thus also served by the adjacent bi-folding doors. Whilst concern has been expressed with regard to the impact of the extension on these bi-fold doors, these

are set further from away from the proposed extension and given their width, the 45 degree line from their centre point would be significantly cleared such that the proposal would not impact light to an unacceptable degree or appear unduly intrusive. The development would be clearly visible from the immediate garden area of No. 86 but given its siting, orientation and projection it would not appear so dominant as to be oppressive or harm residential amenity to an unacceptable level.

9.12 It is acknowledged that the single storey rear extension will extend yet further behind the rear elevation of No. 86 but given it is set further within the site it would not have any significant adverse effect with regard to light or visual intrusion.

9.13 It is proposed to introduce a side facing, first floor window within the existing property that would face No. 86. This window would serve a bathroom. Given its siting, to ensure no loss of privacy or unacceptable level of overlooking, it is considered necessary and reasonable to condition it be fitted with obscure glazing and non-opening below 1.7m from finished floor level. With the inclusion of such a condition there would be no harm to the adjacent property.

#### *No. 82 Gravel Lane*

9.14 No. 82 is located to the north of the application site and given the staggered street scene is set back behind the application property. No. 82 features side facing, high level ground and first floor windows in its southern side elevation. Having reviewed previous plans for the property and having regard to the representations received, these windows serve a hall-way/home-office at ground floor level and the landing at first floor. Given the open-plan nature it is acknowledged that the ground floor window also partially serves the habitable rooms beyond this, however it is important to note that these habitable rooms are also served by their own secondary light sources (additional windows to the rear elevation for example) which will not be impacted by the proposed development.

9.15 The two storey rear extension proposed would project just over 1m and the single storey element would then extend a further 2.15m to the rear. Both would therefore be sited directly in front of the side facing windows of No. 82. However, given these windows do not serve habitable rooms, and due to the fact that the extension extends only partially across them at first floor level it is concluded that a refusal could not be sustained. The proposal would have no impact on the rear facing windows of No. 82 as they are set further to the west.

9.16 It is proposed to introduce doors and a Juliette balcony at first floor level within the two storey rear extension. The plans show that the balcony would project very slightly beyond the rear wall and thus would permit direct views to the side (as you could slightly step out onto it) which is unacceptable. A true Juliette balcony would have a flush fitting screen permitting oblique views only and would therefore have no greater overlooking than a standard window. With the inclusion of a condition requiring the balcony screen to be flush fitting it is concluded that there would be no loss of privacy. It is also important to note that given the extension would result in the fenestration being further to the rear the views would be more oblique and in fact possible less intrusive than the existing window which is further to the east. It is important to note that an existing window can be replaced by doors and Juliette balcony without the need for planning permission (Class A permitted development) and whilst in this instance it is in the extension so needs permission the existing could be altered and this would have a similar/worse impact. This should be given weight in the current considerations. A refusal on this ground alone could not be sustained.

9.17 Turning to the front and the proposed first floor/two storey front extension, it is proposed to extend at first floor level over the existing garage which would be sited in front of No. 82. However, the development would clear a 45 degree line in plan and elevation from the front facing master bedroom window and the window at ground floor level, such that a refusal could not be sustained. Sufficient open aspect and light would continue to reach these rooms and the separation is such that the extensions would not appear oppressive.

#### *Impact of the proposed Outbuilding*

9.18 The proposed outbuilding would be sited at the very rear of the garden and measure 8.3m in width by 3.3m in depth with a mono-pitch roof 2.35m at its lowest point, rising to 3m. Its siting would straddle the rear gardens of Nos 2 and 3 Counters Close to the west and it would be set away from both side boundaries.

9.19 Whilst concern has been raised by neighbours, given its siting, height and design it is concluded that the outbuilding structure would not appear unduly dominant or visually intrusive to the detriment of residential amenity. The size and particularly the height are not excessive and the separation distance between it and the nearest adjacent properties is sufficient to avoid unacceptable harm. The height at the rear has been kept to a minimum at 2.35m above ground level, with a mono-pitch roof sloping away from Nos 2 and 3 Counters Close, which would help minimise the visual impact. It is important to note that at the point it abuts the rear boundary the outbuilding is lower than what would be permissible without planning permission (ie 2.5m). There is no fenestration proposed to the side elevations and whilst there is a large opening which would face towards the properties of Gravel Lane, these views already exist from the garden area. Whilst it is acknowledged that the provision of an outbuilding would increase overlooking as it could be used whatever the weather, the separation distance, oblique angle, and existing boundary would mitigate any harm. In addition it is important to note that these views would be the same from a slightly lower outbuilding that wouldn't require consent (ie a permitted development fall back position) and this is a material consideration that should be afforded significant weight.

9.20 The outbuilding is proposed to comprise a shower room to the rear corner and is annotated as a garden room and shed. Whilst the concerns of neighbours in relation to the use are noted, there is no evidence to suggest the building would be used for residential accommodation/purposes and there is no kitchen facilities proposed such that it could not be used independently to the main dwelling. Its use for independent residential accommodation would require planning permission and there is insufficient parking and amenity to serve a new unit such that a condition will be imposed ensuring that it remains incidental to the main dwelling and is not used separately.

9.21 Based on the above, the proposals are considered to be in accordance with Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan and Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy.

#### Impact on Highway Safety and Parking

9.22 The NPPF (2023), Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013), and the Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (2020) all seek to ensure that new development provides safe and sufficient parking provision for current and future occupiers.

9.23 The proposal does not seek to alter the access or parking arrangements. There is an additional bedroom being proposed. In accordance with the Council's Parking Standards SPD a four bedroom property in this location would require three allocated off-street parking spaces. There is a generous frontage to the application site such that sufficient parking can be accommodated. The proposed development would not result in residual harm to highway safety.

9.24 Overall, it is considered that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

#### Other Material Planning Considerations

9.25 None

#### Response to Neighbour Comments

9.26 Objection have been received from neighbouring properties raising the following points:

- *Loss of light, overbearing and visually intrusive to existing rooms and garden areas of adjacent properties.*

**Officer comment:** This has been addressed above within the 'neighbouring amenity' section of the report.

- *Overshadowing of adjacent properties, plants and pond.*

**Officer comment:** This has been addressed above within the 'neighbouring amenity' section of the report. The adjacent landscaping is not protected and as such any loss of light to it as a result of the development could not be taken into account. Whilst any loss of light to the pond may adversely affect ecology, given the size of the pond any impact would be minimal and would not be grounds for refusal.

- *The garden room is imposing and can't be more than 2.5m high.*

**Officer comment:** the size restrictions referred to are for Class E Permitted Development Right limitations (i.e the size of a structure that doesn't require formal permission), the proposed outbuilding is taller and as such requires permission and must be assessed as part of this application – the outbuilding is fully assessed in each section of the report.

- *The size, materials and design of the Garden room are not as a garden room but appear more as residential accommodation/ a bungalow and are out of keeping and could be used separately to the dwelling.*

**Officer comment:** this has been addressed above and the use will be conditioned

- *The construction of the garden room may harm existing trees, many trees have already been removed.*

**Officer comment:** There are no trees of significance affected by the proposals and the removal of any trees previously removed would not have required consent.

- *Applications for planning permission on adjacent properties were made to be amended and reduced in size and scale as they were considered too imposing and overbearing so the current application should also be.*

**Officer comment:** Each application must be assessed on its own merits.

- *The dimensions of the extensions and their height is not clearly shown.*

**Officer comment:** Existing and proposed plans have been submitted and contain scale bars such that all dimensions can accurately be ascertained and assessed.

- *The Juliette balcony and side facing windows will result in a loss of privacy and overlooking of adjacent properties.*

**Officer comment:** This has been addressed in the report above.

- *The foundations and building works may adversely affect the structural integrity of adjacent properties.*

**Officer comment:** This matter would be dealt with under Building Regulations and Party Wall Agreements and is not a material consideration under the planning system.

### Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

9.27 Policy CS35 of the Core Strategy 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 was adopted in February 2015 and came into force on 1 July 2015. CIL relief is available for affordable housing, charities and Self Builders and may be claimed using the appropriate forms.

## **10. CONCLUSION**

10.1 It is not felt that the works would have an adverse impact on the appearance of the dwelling or would significantly impact the overall character and appearance of this part of the street scene. The development would not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties or highway safety/car parking. Therefore, the proposal is acceptable in accordance with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023 and Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy 2006-2031.

## **11. RECOMMENDATION**

11.1 That planning permission be GRANTED.

### **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:**

**722 / D002 Rev B  
722 / D003 Rev D  
722 / D004 Rev A  
722 / D005 Rev B  
722 / D006 Rev A  
722 / D007  
Location Plan**

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

- 3. The window(s) at first floor level in the side elevations of the dwelling shall be non-opening (unless the part of the window that opens is above 1.7m from floor level) and permanently fitted with obscured glass with a minimum of privacy level three.**



Reason: In the interests of the residential amenities of the occupants of the adjacent dwellings in accordance with Policy CS12 (c) of the Dacorum Borough Council Core Strategy (2013) and Paragraph 135 (f) of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023).

4. **Notwithstanding the detail shown on drawing No.s 722 / D002 Rev B, 722 / D003 Rev D, the Juliette balcony hereby permitted shall be permanently fitted with a flush fitting screen / balustrade to prevent occupation of any area outside the envelope of the building, and thereafter permanently retained.**

Reason: to safeguard the residential amenities of adjacent properties in accordance with Policy Cs12 of the Core Strategy 2013.

5. **The outbuilding hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling known as 84 Gravel Lane and shall not be independently occupied.**

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the use of the development remains ancillary to the use of the main dwellinghouse without allowing the intensification of residential accommodation within the site and to safeguard the residential amenities of adjacent properties in accordance with CS4, and CS12 of the Core Strategy 2013

**APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES**

Consultee	Comments
-----------	----------

**APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES**

**Number of Neighbour Comments**

Neighbour Consultations	Contributors	Neutral	Objections	Support
7	3	0	3	0

**Neighbour Responses**

Address	Comments
3 Counters Close Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 1SE	<p>The materials and size of the proposed Garden Room is not in keeping with the accepted concept of a Garden Room.</p> <p>The size and materials and the foundations required would result in a building that is similar to a small bungalow, and the provisions within of kitchen and toilet facilities could lend itself to the building being used as a habitable structure, rather than one that is for work and recreational use.</p>

	<p>The applicant has already removed a large amount of plants/trees from the garden and the close proximity of the building is likely to compromise the root structure of the remaining apple tree and therefore its eventual loss.</p> <p>It is on these grounds that it is asked that the size and structure of the Garden Room be appraised and something more in keeping be proposed.</p>
<p>86 Gravel Lane Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 1SB</p>	<p>All of our reasons for objecting are the same as the previous application, with additional comments which are as follows:</p> <p>Visual intrusion in addition to the above for the following reasons:</p> <p>The rear extension comes out from the current property by nearly 5 metres causing loss of light and overshadowing in our kitchen and rear bedroom windows. There will be a significant visual intrusion from both of these windows and in our garden as a whole. One plan shows a sight line from our kitchen area but there is no consideration for the sight line from our bi-fold doors. These cover 3/4 of the back of our ground floor and protrude more than the kitchen and hence creates more intrusion.</p> <p>The garden as a whole will still be overshadowed and overlooked causing loss of light and privacy.</p> <p>The front extension plans will cause considerable loss of light to both our utility room and upstairs bathroom window, as there is just over 1.5 metres separating properties along with the planned pitch of the roof means the percentage of light lost is greater. Also the plans for front extension will not fully be in keeping with the streetscape of the road.</p> <p>The garden room being constructed from brick will be very imposing and not fitting for a garden room and appears to more like living quarters. We are concerned with the size of the building, we understood that it cannot be more that 2.5 metres high at the highest point. The plans currently show 3.0 metres tall. Does this height contravene the building regulations? Also meaning it would sit an additional 0.5 metres above our shed and summer room, again causing visual intrusion.</p> <p>On a previous application for our property the previous owners had to amend their application as it was noted that the front extension was visually intrusive / overbearing / oppressive and the plan was amended to the property it is now. 84 are making an application to extend their property in the same manor and I would hope the same consideration will be given for this application.</p> <p>We are also concerned with how the general building works and the foundations in particular will have an adverse affect on our property due to the close proximity, less than 1.5 metres, of the two properties. We may need to consider a party wall agreement.</p>
<p>82 Gravel Lane Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire</p>	<p>1. Rear extension</p> <p>There remains no specified dimensional detail on how far the 2 storey</p>

HP1 1SB

element of the rear extension adds to the house on the side closest to our property. Nor is there specific dimension detail on the roof height of the single storey element of the rear extension. Working from the scale drawing, I estimate the 2 storey element to add ~1.5 meters to the house, while the roof of the single storey element appears to be ~3.5 meters high, sloping down to ~2.5 meters. Based on these measurements the cumulation of the rear extension will entirely overshadow both the ground floor and second floor side windows of our property, becoming a complete visual intrusion while most importantly and disappointingly, blocking 100% of natural light into our open plan living area.

The juliet balcony will also be an intrusion of privacy, as there will be a direct line of sight through to the second floor side window, to our upstairs bedrooms and directly into our family bathroom. With full height glass doors to the balcony, it provides a direct line of sight to our patio and garden and we will also be able to look directly into No 84 master bedroom from our garden due to the full height glass doors providing no privacy screen.

## 2. Front extension

The front 2 storey extension plans will cause significant loss of light to both our downstairs open plan dining and living area, hallway and upstairs master bedroom.

It will also vastly eliminate sunlight to the plants, trees and wild pond in the front garden due to the direction of the morning and midday sun.

## 3. Additional 2nd storey side window

The plans include a 2nd storey side window looking on to our property, this will significantly intrude on our privacy as it will look directly into both our ground and second floor side windows.

## 4. Garden room

The brick walls, plumbing, shower room and kitchen worktop/cupboards which are detailed in the plans strongly indicate that this building will be used as an additional dwelling/habitable space. If so, this would require planning permission specifically for 'granny annexe'.

The brick walls are also not in keeping with all other garden rooms in the area.

## Additional comments;

In addition to our previous comments, we want to provide additional clarification that this proposed development will substantially block light directly into our downstairs home office which will significantly impact our working environment.

A juliette balcony is not an essential addition to a home. The proposed juliette balcony will be a huge intrusion of our privacy. Someone would be able to stand on the juliette balcony and look directly into our

	<p>upstairs hallway, see into the entrance of all of our 4 bedrooms and directly into our bathroom when the bathroom door is open. This will hugely impact our life in our own home, no-one will feel comfortable upstairs knowing the neighbour could watch us from their balcony. xxxxxxx. I would like to reiterate, a juliette balcony is not essential to their home, but the impact it would have on our privacy and mental wellbeing in our own home is huge.</p>
--	--