

## DC Admin

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** 22 July 2026 16:39  
**To:** Katie Chew  
**Cc:** DC Admin  
**Subject:** Planning Application 2026/91657 - Comment - Apparent Eastward Extension of Plot 23 and Reduced Separation from No. 92

**CAUTION:** External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good afternoon, Ms Chew,

I wish to raise a further objection concerning an apparent discrepancy between the dimensions of Plot 23 shown on the site/layout plans and those shown on the detailed house-type plans and elevations.

That discrepancy affects the position of the projecting veranda and the actual separation between Plot 23 and No. 92 Lingards Road.

### **How the apparent 1 metre discrepancy has been identified**

The site/layout plans show the overall width of Plot 23 as approximately 1 metre less than the width shown on the detailed floor plans and elevations for the same dwelling.

The front elevation has also been measured on site, insofar as reasonably possible, and appears to correspond with the greater width shown on the detailed house-type drawings rather than the shorter footprint represented on the site/layout plan.

If the western side of the foundations was set out in the position shown on the layout plan, the additional approximately 1 metre of built width must extend from the eastern side of the dwelling. The eastern elevation—and therefore the veranda positioned at the front/eastern corner—would consequently be approximately 1 metre farther east than represented on the site/layout plan.

This is not an unsupported assumption that the entire dwelling has simply moved bodily by 1 metre. It is an inference drawn from:

- the approximately 1 metre difference between the width shown on the site/layout plan and the detailed drawings;
- the apparent correspondence between the constructed front elevation and the wider detailed drawings; and
- the assumption that the western foundation line was set out in its submitted position.

For the purpose of assessing the relationship with No. 92, the practical consequence is that the eastern corner of Plot 23 may project approximately 1 metre farther towards that side of the site than the layout plan indicates.

## Effect upon the separation from No. 92

Measurement from the submitted site/layout plan gives an approximate physical separation of 21.13 metres between the projecting veranda and No. 92.

However, that measurement uses the shorter Plot 23 footprint shown on the layout plan. It does not account for the additional width shown on the detailed plans and apparently constructed on site.

Because the eastward extension is oblique to the shortest line between the veranda and No. 92, the separation would not reduce by the full 1 metre. Based upon the orientation of the two properties shown on the plan, the component of the additional width directed towards No. 92 is estimated to be approximately **0.56 metres**.

The resulting estimated separation would therefore be:

$$21.13 \text{ metres} - 0.56 \text{ metres} = \text{approximately } 20.57 \text{ metres}$$

This figure is necessarily an estimate pending an accurate as-built coordinate survey. Nevertheless, it demonstrates that the site/layout plan may overstate the true separation by more than half a metre.

## Significance of the veranda

The affected part of Plot 23 is the projecting veranda at its front/eastern corner.

The supporting material submitted under application 2024/91236 identifies this veranda as an external seating area where residents may sit and enjoy a morning coffee. It is therefore intended to be occupied and is not merely a decorative roof projection.

The apparent eastward extension would bring this occupied seating area closer to No. 92 than the site/layout plan suggests. This is relevant to the assessment of:

- overlooking and perceived overlooking;
- privacy;
- noise and activity associated with external seating;
- outlook;
- visual prominence; and
- residential amenity.

It may also alter the angle of view from the veranda towards the habitable bedroom windows and private amenity space of No. 92.

## Verification required

Before application 2026/91657 is determined, the Council should reconcile the dimensional inconsistency between the site/layout plans and the detailed house-type drawings.

An accurate as-built survey should establish:

- the actual width of Plot 23;

- the approved and constructed positions of its western and eastern elevations;
- whether the western foundation line was constructed in its submitted position;
- the actual coordinates of the veranda;
- the shortest separation between the veranda and No. 92; and
- the resulting sightlines towards the windows and private amenity space of No. 92.

## **Conclusion**

The estimated eastward displacement of the veranda has not been arrived at arbitrarily. It results from an approximately 1 metre discrepancy between the width of Plot 23 shown on the site/layout plan and that shown on the detailed plans and elevations, supported by measurements of the constructed front elevation.

Assuming the western foundation line remained in its submitted position, the eastern elevation and veranda would extend approximately 1 metre farther east. Because that extension is oblique to No. 92, it is estimated to reduce the physical separation by approximately 0.56 metres, from about 21.13 metres to 20.57 metres.

The Council should not rely upon the separation indicated by the site/layout plan until the dimensional inconsistency and the actual as-built position of the veranda have been independently verified.

I ask that my personal detail not be made public.

Kind regards