

David Parry

From: Mared Rees-Jones <Mared.Rees-Jones@wrexham.gov.uk>
Sent: 08 November 2019 13:31
To: 'david@davidparryarchitect.co.uk'
Subject: RE: P/2019/0727 - Chantry Meade, Pistyll Hill

Hi David

Thanks for sending the plans through.

I have had a chance to look at these and have concerns with the distance from the rear elevation of the proposed extension and terrace area in relation to the rear elevation and garden area of the property to the east, known as Tintern.

The rear lounge windows at first floor level would measure approximately 24m away from the rear elevation of Tintern. Local Planning Guidance Note 21 states that there should be a distance of 22m between habitable windows on flat ground. For each 0.5m difference in height between neighbouring properties, this distance should be increased by 1m.

As per the section drawing, the ground level difference between both properties is 3m, therefore an additional 6m should be applied to the 22m distance. Furthermore, for properties which have more than 2 storeys, an additional 2m should be applied if these properties face dwellings with a standard 2 storey height. Therefore, the guidance indicates that an additional 8m should be applied in this instance, given the difference in ground levels.

The proposed windows serving the lounge would measure approximately 24m away from the rear elevation of Tintern at its nearest point and approximately 27m away at its furthest point. This would be a shortfall of 6m and 3m respectively in accordance with the guidance.

The roof terrace would measure approximately 20m at its nearest point and 23m away at its furthest point from the rear elevation of the dwelling. Therefore failing the recommended guidance by 10m and 7m respectively.

As well as resulting in an increase in overlooking into the property itself, the extension would also significantly increase overlooking into the garden area of the property, given the increase in height of the property over the existing. The height increase overall is 2.6m which I also consider has the potential to be overbearing and would appear quite dominant when viewed in the context of surrounding properties.

For the reasons outlined above, I am of the opinion that the proposal would adversely impact on residential amenities of the neighbouring property and also has the potential to impact adversely on existing visual amenities of the area and for this reason I do not consider I can support the proposal.

Please let me know how you wish to proceed.

Thanks

Mared

From: david@davidparryarchitect.co.uk [mailto:david@davidparryarchitect.co.uk]
Sent: 03 November 2019 08:29