

Ref **21/00113/SUB**

Re planning application for: - **Erection of single storey extensions to front, side and rear and new boundary treatment 30 Baugh Close, Blackfell, Washington, NE37 1SN**

We are writing to object to the above planning application due to a number of issues that would adversely affect our property (No. 29) and the immediate area.

Our property adjoins that which the planning application concerns.

In relation to the proposed extension, we still have the following objections:

1) The proposed construction of solid wooden gates and a 6-foot-high wall around the boundary of the front of the property is still on the proposed site plan. We were under the impression this had been removed in order for the previous planning application to be granted. If this is not the case, and it is back on the plan, we still object due to the following reasons:

- i) The design does not fit in with the open plan style and character of the cul-de-sac, or that of the Mayfield estate as a whole. The proposed enclosing of the front of the property would have a detrimental effect on the cul-de-sac due to being overbearing and out of character in terms of appearance.
- ii) No other attached houses on the estate have a division of such height between the properties. Any markers of boundaries to the front of properties are done so with planting or low walls or fences, no higher than the front windowsill.
- iii) Construction of such a high division between our adjoining front lawns would overshadow our garden and front window, vastly reducing the outlook from our property.
- iv) With reference to Miss Twiddy's previous letter of support for this aspect of the proposal, the property at No 1 Baugh Close does not have a wall surrounding it. The wall referenced only separates the property from No 2 Rogan Avenue between the drives, and was built when the estate was under construction as this property was one of the show houses and the wall hid the view of the building site. The front boundary is marked by bushes, not a wall, and the shared front boundary between No 1 and the adjoining No 2 Baugh Close is marked by a low open style fence, in keeping the style of the estate as stated in the second point above.

2) The planned extension is now being amended to show it to be entirely rendered white. The style of all the properties on the Mayfield estate is brick, and only the upper floor rendered on a small minority of houses. Therefore, rendering the ground floor does not fit in with the style of the street, or the estate as a whole.

3) The proposed section document clearly shows a white rendered wall to the back of the extension, which will face our property. The dividing fence that currently exists is not the property of the residents of number 30. This fence is our property, it is erected entirely on our land and it **will not** be removed as a consequence of the planned rear extension by Mrs. Smith. We therefore fail to see how it will be possible to render this wall, if permission is granted, as it will be built directly next to our 6' high fence.

Thank you for taking time to consider our objections.

Mr S and Mrs C Pinnegar

29 Baugh Close