

PLANNING COMMITTEE

3rd October 2017

Extra Information

Page	App. No.	Address
56	2017/0439	10 Keppelwray Drive, Barrow-in-Furness.

Extra Information for Planning Committee Meeting 03/10/2017

Plan number 2017/0439 10 Keppelwray drive, Barrow-in-Furness

Comments from 12 Keppelwray Drive, Barrow-in-Furness

"I am writing to you following our telephone call of Monday 18th September to object, formally, to planning application B21/2017/0439 for additional construction to number 10 Keppelwray Drive, Barrow in Furness – specifically for a rear extension/'sunroom'.

As I related to you during our conversation, I was not aware of Mr & Mrs McMillan's intentions until I was contacted by your office: and though I have, since, attempted to find a compromise solution addressing my concerns about the project with them, they have only advised me to follow the course of action which I now undertake.

In essence, I am very worried that the rearwards growth of number 10 Keppelwray Drive will destroy virtually all of the light transmission into the main bedroom of my bungalow, number 12 Keppelwray Drive.

Before I give you more detail as to why I fear such an unfortunate outcome of the proposed build, I would like you to remember that my wife and I are both well into our nineties, find movement outside of the home increasingly difficult, and especially value the benefits of the aspect of our bedroom in a house that we bought off-plan in 1977.

My case is that, as you will be aware, numbers 10 & 12 Keppelwray Drive (identical floor-plan designs) have been set on their respective plots in a deliberate east/west echelon arrangement: this maximises light collection from a westerly setting sun in the evening of course, but is also effective at optimising light from a transiting sun in the southern sky during the majority of the day to EACH building. The north wall of both bungalows is therefore without aperture, whilst the south wall has a major window – into the main/our bedroom. If this window is obstructed in any way, the original interior design philosophy is, at the very least, denuded, if not completely nullified.

To quantify my position with some numbers: the new sunroom wall will be 5.5 metres in length; it will, therefore, extend past the entire length of my bedroom window and, at some 8 feet elevation, it will rise to no less than 2 feet above it. From our talk, you appeared to believe that the width of my access drive (separating the two properties) mitigated the effects of such a construction, but how can this be so? The drive is only 12 feet wide and does not, nor can not, offer any kind of realistic buffer against the light-masking effects of such a large edifice.

Moreover, I am particularly concerned that the wall of the proposed sunroom will not even be constructed of glass or, indeed, some other light-transmissible material - it is reported as a basic brick design. Obviously, therefore, no light will be passed/reflected-on by it and only an area of intense localised shade created. Even a dwarf wall/conservatory type of arrangement would, I believe, have had

considerable merit and been acceptable to me, but a simple (high and long) red brick structure provides no benefit or relief. In sum, as the new building will transgress 100% of my window's surface area, our main bedroom will now be masked, especially from a low-angle winter sun, virtually all day long.

Finally, I want you to note that whilst I believe that the forward/front extension plan for number 10 also negates the design concept of the house builder (by again 'creating' shade), I have no objection to its construction - as my property will not be blighted significantly by its initiation. I am only concerned, and therefore am writing to protest, about the rear elevation.

I trust that you will consider carefully the points that I have raised. If you wish to conduct a site visit to number 12 and view the proposed dimensions from my aspect, I will only be too happy to facilitate it and, hopefully, thus help find a compromise solution to the situation. I remain, and wish to be, flexible in my position, but, equally, because of the minimal information/involvement I have been given in proceedings so far, I can't help but feel that I am the only participant in the discussion that is interested in doing so."