

Comments for Planning Application DC/20/2254/HH

Application Summary

Application Number: DC/20/2254/HH

Address: 4 Reeds Buildings Bury St Edmunds IP33 1HU

Proposal: Householder application - a. front porch b. rear two-storey extension

Case Officer: Olivia Luckhurst

Customer Details

Name: Mr Matthew Hughes

Address: 5 Reeds Buildings, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk IP33 1HU

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other
- Plan queries

Comment: Privacy

There will be a loss of privacy on 2 fronts with the construction of the 1st floor extension, namely:

1 The notional window at the gable end facing the car parking area, would overlook the gardens of the neighbours. Unlike the current set up where windows in the smaller bedrooms are set back from the existing ground floor extension by some considerable distance. Any suggested augmentation of the upper floor of the property would bring the larger gable end window into a position where even the area of a neighbour's patio directly outside the entrance door can now be observed from the above.

In other words, no area of driveside gardens is free from observation from the property under review

2 The Velux windows on the sides of the proposed bedroom these face along the length of the terrace on the side of which many bedroom windows exist. Certainly, within the bedroom there is potential to look out across the flat roofs of the remaining houses into both the adjacent residencies. Viewing beyond to the houses 2 doors away might also be possible.

A similar increase in living space could be achieved without any intrusion of privacy if the ground floor proposition is enhanced to a longer length than that in the current request. Such a revised longer ground floor extensions & permanent new buildings of similar area which allow a ground floor bathroom have previously been made elsewhere at Reeds Buildings notable 10 & 12.

If a longer alternative ground floor extension were to be considered where all suggested additional new floor space were to be kept to the ground floor with NO 1st floor development, there would be no objections to such as proposal as this would be more in keeping with the character of a set of 160 year old row of terraced houses.

The current suggestion overlooks private areas & is a loss of privacy, as such an objection is

raised & consideration for rejection of the plans should be contemplated.