

Comments for Planning Application 21/00104/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00104/FUL

Address: 6 Burgess Mead Oxford OX2 6XP

Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension. Insertion of 3no. rooflights to rear elevation. Insertion of gas flue. Removal of boundary wall and provision of bin stores.

Case Officer: Charles Refson

Customer Details

Name: Dr Stamatis Pagakis

Address: 4 Burgess Mead Oxford OX2 6XP

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbours

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Effect on adjoining properties
- Height of proposal
- Light - daylight/sunlight

Comment: We are the owners of 4 Burgess Mead (BM), neighbours of 6 Burgess Mead, site of the proposed extension, immediately to the right (North).

Although we appreciate the fact that the proposal seems to be professionally designed, with high quality materials matching the rest of the estate, we have two serious and interrelated concerns that we would like to express here.

Since the proposal appears to be highly similar to the extension already completed at No10 Burgess Mead, we will be using this case for comparisons.

1. Loss of light

Our property is adjacent to the proposed development, towards the North, and the windows of our back room (which is the main living area of the house) are facing West. This means that the ONLY direct light we get is from the afternoon sun, and is coming from the left (South) as we step into our back garden. Having a 3-meter wall erected immediately to the left of our garden door, which is the main source of sun and light into the living room, will be seriously affecting our right to light.

We appreciate that the developers have introduced a sloped roof concept to reduce this negative effect on the amenity of our house. A similar measure was included in the extension at No10 BM. However, there are important differences between No6 and No10 BM that we would like to

discuss:

a) Whereas in No 10 BM the slope is at 30 degrees from the horizontal, in our case it is increased to 40 degrees.

b) Whereas in No 10 BM the height of the new wall is shown to be 2,85cm from DPC level, in the proposed extension it is shown at 2,95, that is 10cm higher.

While it is possible that these modest differences will not have an impact, we need to ensure they will not further reduce the amount of light into our back garden. This brings us to the third issue of concern:

c) Whereas the No 10 BM proposal included a neighbouring property light impact study (LIGHT_IMPACTS-2115984), there is no such study included in the proposal of 6 Burgess Mead. This is unfortunate, because:

d) Due to the crescent shape of the terrace, our back garden is facing more to the North than the equivalent property (No8 Burgess Mead) involved in the 10 BM extension.

For all these reasons we are concerned that we could have a considerably more severe reduction to the amount of light into our back garden and living room, compared to that shown in the study conducted for No10BM.

Therefore, we would like the council to seriously consider our concerns and examine the results of a similar Light Impact study for our case, before a decision is made. In our opinion, this extension, although very similar in design, is NOT equivalent to the one in No10 BM, primarily due to the different orientation of the properties, and secondarily/potentially the different height and slope of the proposed construction. Since our property is now rented, we are genuinely worried that the reduction of light/sun into our garden and living room will lead to both loss in rental income and loss of long-term amenity.

2. Size of the extension

The size of the proposed extension is very large (exceeding 3 meters in length) and as such warrants extended study of its impact to the neighbours, as outlined here:

https://www.planningportal.co.uk/info/200130/common_projects/17/extensions

and here

https://www.planningportal.co.uk/info/200187/your_responsibilities/37/planning_permission/6

We understand that for such large extensions a prior approval is required. Apart from the fact that we never received a letter for neighbour consultation, as these guidelines suggest, we are concerned that such a large construction immediately adjacent to our property will have a serious impact on its attractiveness and, consequently, on its value.

Hence, in conclusion, we would like:

A) To request that a neighbouring property light impact study be conducted.

B) The council to consider our suggestion that the effective size of the extension be reduced, particularly in height but also in length.

This could be achieved in several, not mutually exclusive, ways:

(i) by lowering the overall height of the extension to at least 2.75m.

(ii) by having the roof sloped in a more shallow angle (as in the No10 extension)

(iii) by having the roof sloped along its whole length (and not, as currently proposed, from the point of 2.13 meters from the back wall of the crescent),

(iv) by shortening the length of the extension closer to 3 metres.

C) To request that, if the project goes ahead, proper specifications be placed for the screening between the properties to safeguard privacy and safety as well as properly adhering to the Party wall act guidelines. We haven't been informed, consulted or seen anything on the site about these issues.