

Re Planning Application number **2018/93228**

10 Quarry Court, Longwood

Without Prejudice

Dear Mr Harrison

I wish to raise my objections to the above application for a couple of reasons.

A major objection concerns the impact, both visual and positional, of the proposed extension on the rest of the properties. Visually, I believe the large extension would represent an over intensification of building on what is already the smallest detached plot, leaving very little garden. The extended property would look too big for the plot. This is in contrast to the other properties in Quarry Court which are surrounded by greenery. In addition, the original development was designed to be in the style of weavers' cottages, with banks of mullion windows. The proposed extension would contravene this with a large expanse of blank stone wall facing the street. This I believe would look out of character with the rest of the properties and spoil the existing symmetry between numbers 8, 10 and 12. The whole visual amenity of the street would be harmed should this extension be allowed to go ahead.

From a positional point of view, number 10 is already built at a significantly higher level than number 8 and the construction of a large raised patio would provide a viewing platform over my garden, resulting in a great loss of privacy. This is in addition to the loss of privacy to number 12 due to the proximity of the extension to the principle elevation of number 12.

My second major objection concerns the access between number 8 and 10 because of the intrusive nature of it and the impact on my property. From looking at the plans, it appears that this route is to become the main access to the rear of number 10. An impact assessment on our property now needs to be performed as this path passes within around 2 metres of the lounge window, at a height of almost window sill level. Regular use of this access would be extremely intrusive and detrimental to my enjoyment of my principle room. This I believe is against Protocol 1, Article 1 of the Human Rights Act, which is the right to peaceful enjoyment of my property.

The plans also contain obvious factual inaccuracies such as missing chimneys from both properties, but especially from number 8. The effect of this is to give the impression that there is much more room for access between number 8 and 10, when in effect the applicants only have in the region of 50cm in width to pass their own chimney, without unacceptable trespass on to my land. From the deeds and Land Registry records, most of the land between the two properties is actually owned by number 8.

I would welcome a site visit so that the objections raised can be fully appreciated.

I respectfully request, that for the above reasons, the planning application is refused

I would like to be kept informed of your decision.