

Dear Sirs,

Thank you for your letter dated the 29<sup>th</sup> January 2021.

We would like the Council to refuse this planning application ref **20/01897/FLH** and object for the following reasons:

1.The arboricultural report submitted does not mitigate the effect of the proposed extension on the TPO tree in our garden. This tree is protected by a tree preservation order would be under stress and damaged by the excavation of the foundations of the two-storey side extension which is situated within the tree root protection area.

There is no block plan that shows the position of the proposed extension in relation to TPO tree's root protection area. We have therefore attached one with this email together with a report we commissioned on the effect of the proposed three storey extension on the TPO tree in our garden.

The British Standard **BS 5837 2012** quite clearly advises that the default position is that structures should be sited outside of the root protection area. The standard advises you should take into account previous development impacts (that may have encroached on trees) and to make a realistic assessment on the impact of the development on the trees and vice versa including factors such as shading, future pressure for removal and seasonal nuisance.

Therefore, we consider that the proposal would damage the tree and as such is contrary to BS5837 2012 and in conflict with the Council's DMPD 2015 Policy DM5 'Trees and Landscape'

2.The proposed 2 storey side extension is 'unneighbourly' due to being so close to the boundary and in conflict with the Council's Householder Applications: Supplementary Planning Guidance 2004, in particular :

(i)clause 3.4 which states 'The aim should be to set back the wall beside the side boundary at least 1m throughout its height, up to the eaves'. Currently the proposed extension is less than 500mm.

(ii)ROOF EXTENSIONS

Generally - Dormers should not normally be introduced on the front or side elevations, to maintain street character. This proposed dormer is in the side.

#### 4 Dormers

4.1 Generally, these should only be used on rear elevations. This application proposes a dormer on the side.

4.6 To protect privacy, there should be no balconies or full-height windows, and side windows should be discouraged. The windows are full height.

4.12 They should be kept below the house ridge line by at least 0.5m. The flat roof of the proposed dormer is approximately 600mm higher than the house ridge line.

Cumulatively the insensitive design of the three-storey side extension (ground, first and second floor dormer accommodation) and massing would materially detract from the character and appearance of the original dwelling and would have a harmful impact on the streetscene, and character and appearance of the wider area, contrary to Policy DM9 and DM10 of the Development Management Policies Document 2015.

Yours faithfully

Jennifer Courtney & John Young  
Executors of the deceased, Mrs Florence Young, of 9 Cudas Close, Stoneleigh, Epsom, KT19 0QF.

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.