

FURTHER UPDATE REPORT

**FOR DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE
MEETING OF 12th October 2021**

Item B1. 2021/0028 - 13 Fernhill Crescent, Stacksteads

2 further letters of objection received, the concerns raised are as follows:

17 Fernhill Crescent

Comment Reasons:

- Close to adjoining properties
- General dislike of proposal
- Loss of privacy
- Out of keeping with character of area
- Residential Amenity

Comment: We have viewed the amended plans for 13 Fernhill Crescent and wish to oppose on the following grounds:

Visual amenity: The plain brick wall on the sides of the extension is out of scale and out of character with the existing rears of neighbouring properties. Other properties have conservatory extensions which are part brick and part glass and are stepped in from the width of the house meaning that they are not so close to their neighbours' boundaries.

The submitted plan drawings are not drawn to scale and give a false impression of the size of the extension. This proposed extension is larger than those of neighbouring properties and extends deeper into the rear garden.

Loss of privacy and amenity: The proposed raised decking will give the householder direct line of sight into my main living space and will also overlook my garden. The plan drawings indicate that it will be at the same height as the floor level of the main house. The rear gardens to our properties slope steeply, if the householder at 13 Fernhill Crescent has a platform 5m from the existing rear of his house at the same level as the house floor level it will give him a platform which is 1.7m above ground level enabling him to overlook my garden and view inside my home. All other householders have rear doors on or next to the main house with steps immediately going down into the garden; they do not have raised viewing platforms part-way down their gardens.

9 Fernhill Crescent

Comment Reasons:

- Loss of privacy
- Out of keeping with character of area

Comment: We cannot understand how the 2nd proposal put to the planning department was declined and yet the proposed build has been reverted back to the 2nd proposal with adjustments.

How can a build be declined then resurrected again?

We would like to protest in the strongest possible terms regarding this build. The development is far too high and as a result our privacy will be compromised. We have lived here for 40 years and never has there been so much animosity towards neighbours as has been shown here. Our views and concerns (as well as my neighbours) have not been taken into consideration by Mr & Mrs Ashworth. They have not spoken to us regarding our concerns and I am sure they have spoken to no one else either, or I think some of the issues could have been resolved. Looking at this from our property it looks like Mr & Mrs Ashworth can see straight into our garden and we feel that our privacy will be severely compromised, (even though I live two doors down) because the back gardens are on a decline all the other houses on this side of the Crescent step down. Why can Mr & Mrs Ashworth not step down onto their decking limiting the privacy objection and making their property in keeping with the area. They will be able to stand on the decking looking 180 degrees around them and look into peoples houses/gardens. We feel that if this build is allowed it will be a complete eyesore, privacy will be compromised and it will not be in keeping with the area. We respectfully hope that this build be rejected due to our above concerns.

Also, the residents of 11 Fernhill Crescent wish for their objection to be reported as the whole letter that was submitted rather than as the bullet points shown on the Update Report of 8.10.2021.

The letter is as follows:

'Upper raised platform/decking area:

This exact proposal was previously refused and pulled from Committee by Mike Atherton on the grounds of privacy loss. Why has this been allowed to be resubmitted when it was not acceptable previously in planning terms?

We **strongly** object to the 1.7m raised platform exiting the extension at floor level as this will lead to total loss of privacy for us with the residents at number 13 having full line of sight into our kitchen and rear living space.

The extreme fence height proposed at 2.5m will not protect our privacy from this raised platform due to the sloping nature of the garden at number 13. Our own recent planning application included extending our existing patio which is immediately stepped down from our back door by approx. 900mm.

We are aware that similar planning applications have been refused with platforms exiting the property at floor level due to loss of privacy for neighbouring properties.

Overall, the revised plans **still** do not respect the existing surrounding properties in terms of scale, size and design. The proposal of a solid brick build spanning the width of the property and 4m to the rear is not in keeping due to no other properties on the crescent having full width extensions. All properties on this side of the Crescent were built with a step back of 2-3m from the neighbouring property in order to maintain privacy. This proposal would create a boxing in effect to our property

due to it being situated within 1m of the boundary.

We would like to point out again that we do not consent to the removal of the existing boundary fence or boundary gate post which is co-owned by both properties, as confirmed by the previous owner of No.13 and was also requested not to be removed by No.13 when we were installing our own new fences which we respected.

We do not give permission, under any circumstances, for access to be gained to the rear of No.13 via our driveway or land.

Given all the above, we respectfully request that this planning proposal be refused. We would like to add that we don't begrudge anyone wanting to extend or improve their home as long as it doesn't cost us all our privacy. This being said, we would be more accepting of the following:

Instead of walking out onto upper raised decking, it would be more courteous of number 13 to step down into their new extension. This would allow the occupants to then immediately step out of bifold doors onto lower decking at a more neighbour friendly height of 400-500mm. There would still be ample space within the extension itself to allow for a large room whilst respecting our right to privacy within our home.'

In addition, the objection recorded as being from 3 Fernhill Crescent on the Update Report of 8.10.2021 should have been recorded as being from 3 Fernhill Grove.

Mike Atherton
Head of Planning

12/10/2021