

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:

Comment: Loss of light

Suggested upper storey proposal would affect lighting levels (both ambient & direct sunlight) that would reach the bedroom facing the parking lot. Loss of light is also linked to health issues & depression. There would also be the issue that the proposed lower walls of any new bedroom will cast shadows that will promote moss growth & require additional maintenance to ensure that ingress does not damage the property

With the terrace running along a line 264°-076 ° & using solar webtools such as

<https://keisan.casio.com/exec/system/1224682277>

<https://www.timeanddate.com/sun/@2654186>

Direct sunlight currently falls into the affected bedroom in the evenings for many months of the summer. A more generous azimuth of 270° and elevation of 20° would see direct sunshine cast into the drive facing bedroom from the 1st week in May until Mid August

Any suggested upper level extension would reduce light reaching the neighbouring bedroom and is likely to affect the level of enjoyment of the house

There are also concerns that the length of the extension going beyond the existing house would break the 45° rule in the horizontal

A similar increase in living space can be achieved with less loss of light 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 have previously been made elsewhere at Reeds Buildings notable 10&12 allowing for a bigger ground floor bathroom

If a longer alternative ground floor extension were to be considered where all suggested additional new floor space was 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 in keeping with the character of a set of 160 year old row of terraced houses

Current suggestion poses significant loss of direct sunlight, as such an objection is raised &

consideration for rejection of plans should be contemplated