

Appendix 1

List of objections made with regard to planning application at 3 Fendon Close

Below are a summary of the issues raised from the neighbouring property at no.4 objections letter dated 10th October 2017.

Issue	Officer response
Questionable "surveyed" measurements & scale appears to be inaccurate 1) SK-034/R4 2) SK-206/R2 3) SK-251/RO West elevation: Agent has mislabelled existing as extension I do not understand what the agent means by "dimensions are projected (i.e. measured in paper space).	I have checked the measurements highlighted on the plans and these seem to be accurate. The plans have been mislabelled in terms of which part of the building is an extension but this the plans are clear and I do not consider an amendment to the annotation is necessary. An explanation has not been given by the architect regarding his note but the most relevant measurements which relate to the relationship with no. 4 shown on the plans have been checked on site.
Missing plastic pipes from roof missing on plans SK-251/R0	This level of detail is not required.
Rear side wall a) FALSE and or MISLEADING INFORMATION: Unauthorised increase in height of rear wall/"RAMPING" up of ground level. "LEVEL 000" - this image may explain why the agent claims a height of just under 3.8m for the rear wall. The council assured us that the wall would be no	The measured height of the wall is no more than 3.8m from ground level. The ground level does not appear to have been raised.

higher than 3.8m. Statement to LGO stated that wall would not be higher than 3.8m high Length of side wall too long in relation to where it should finish in line with no.4 window. Plans should match reality with regard to positioning of property Materials used should be visible brick only.	Measurements taken and shown on plans show development taken place is not nearer to no.4 than previously granted. The plans show the coping stone and materials as approved
b) Rear side wall Misrepresentation of impact SK-34/R4 "rear living room window" is towards the front of the building (window "B") "middle living room windows" is the rear of two living room windows (agent falsely claims a third window to the side elevation of living room) (window "C") The "main living room window" is to the side of a flat roofed "garden room" that is unused in winter. Agent has not indicated window serving hallway and other internal areas. Agent has however included a "conservatory/garden room" in the floor area of our living room. "proposed second floor" : council has advised that this is not the second floor but is the first floor SK-035/R4	The rear living room at no.4 consists of two windows looking out to the rear extension and internal dividing doors separates this space to a further space adjacent to the rear garden with further windows to the side and to the rear. I have confirmed that this is not the second floor but is the first floor' noted.

"virtually unobstructed" "daylight / sunlight virtually uncompromised" This comment is with reference by agent to first floor bedroom, not the ground floor directly below that lost 10-30%	This has been addressed in this report assessment
Privacy loss from rear balcony issues	This has been addressed by the insertion of obscured glass privacy screens at both ends of the L-shaped balcony
First floor balcony Balustrades The revised application shows metal bars, not a solid balustrade to prevent a "SEATED" person looking into our garden.	A balustrade is shown on the lower part of the balcony. This could allow a user of the balcony to look through gaps in the balustrade. Given the separation distance between this part of the balcony and the side wall of no. 4 (in excess of 10 metres) and the limited opportunity for direct overlooking, I do not consider this impact as harmful.
First floor balcony glazed glass To protect any loss of privacy, the obscured glazing must be from floor level to 1.7m high minimum and be situated flush with rear wall as per plans Statement to LGO stated that there would be no loss of privacy, and therefore obscured glazing should not be moveable.	Fixed obscured glazing to the maximum level has been submitted as per plans and per sample submitted. This has been addressed within the assessment of the report and it is considered that there is no loss of privacy
Possible future external staircase	This is not within the scope of this application
Access to balcony from landing as well as bedroom	Such a change would not amount to development.

Part of design for future HMO use	Measures have been secured to ensure the balcony is screened for all users. There is no indication that the house will be used as a HMO.
Missing window There is a window (w-1.9) missing from SK-035/R4 which is showing on SK-205/R2. Is there or is there not a window? If yes, the window should be fully opaque with restriction.	The window is shown on the plans.
Window should have restrictor and be max Pilkington opaque glazed Side facing window 1.9 on SK-206/R2	This is covered under condition 3
Increased protrusion of overhanging roof eaves SK-206/R5, SK-026/R4 and guttering SK-208/R2 Agent previously stated that the ugly dull grey industrial style roofing would not overhang more than the previous guttering except in the porch area. OBJECT to the increased size and overhang of the guttering at the side of the house which further exacerbates the overshadowing and enclosure caused by the monstrous house. On this image it measures 1m.	I have addressed the issue of design in my assessment. In relation to the overhang, plans show there will be a degree of overhang to the roof.
Velux roof windows Opening is too low in roof line, windows should be obscured glazed and restricted opening. Windows are too large – subject to enforcement investigation.	I have addressed this issue in my assessment

Below are a summary of the issues raised from the neighbouring property at no.4 objections letter dated 7th November 2017.

Issue	Officer response
Reference to previous history of the case/statements made in the context of the LGO investigation Query regarding what the applicant is seeking approval for, what errors are contained in the plans Inaccurate location plan The applicant has down played the impact on no. 4 by providing inaccurate plans	Committee is aware of the previous planning history of this development. If approved the plans which have been submitted with the application (as amended) will be the approved plans. The relationship between no. 3 and no. 4 has been checked on site and this can be verified during the site visit.
Enforcement action/demolition will be required to ensure the development matches the applicants claims	Enforcement action can only be pursued in relation to a deviation from the plans which have been submitted for approval. The statements or claims by the applicant do not form part of the approved documents.
Council officers have acted against the interests of the occupiers of no. 3. The Council has a duty to promote the interests of these occupiers to try and rectify the injustice.	The LGO investigation has already addressed this issue.
The non-structural single storey brick wall should be: reduced in height to 3.8 metres a maximum of 3.8m high from natural ground level from the end point facing no. 4 boundary fence to a point where it no longer protrudes above the side facing wall	A decision needs to be made in relation to the plans that have been submitted for approval. Officers have ensured that the plans match the works on site and further amendments have not be

moved further back from the boundary fence opposite our front most side facing window such that it stands no less than 1.7m from the boundary shortened in length to a point well in advance of a line drawn from the midpoint of our chimney	requested.
The council will ensure that the privacy screen to the side facing terrace area will be fully opaque to an equivalent of Pilkington level 5 from floor level to a minimum of 1.7m high with a condition that the screen remains permanently fitted.	A condition has been recommended to secure the provision of privacy screens prior to occupation of the extension and their retention.
The first floor side facing window will be permanently fitted with obscure glazing and fitted with a restriction device	A condition has been recommended in relation to the window on the western elevation.
The second floor velux windows will be a minimum of 1.7m from floor level	I have addressed this in my assessment.