

I am writing to formally object to the above planning application.

I appreciate that homeowners are entitled to make reasonable alterations to their properties. However, the revised proposal – and in particular the change from a flat roof to a pitched roof with an additional storey – represents a significant and harmful increase in height, bulk, and visual impact. In my view this would cause unacceptable harm to my residential amenity and should be refused in its current form.

I have attached photographs taken from both inside my property and from my rear garden, together with a photograph showing the adjoining neighbouring property which has an existing flat roof garage extension. These images clearly demonstrate the existing character of the area and how the revised proposal would directly intrude into my primary outlook.

My objections are based solely on material planning considerations, as set out below.

1. Overbearing Impact and Loss of Outlook

The existing structure is currently low-level and visually unobtrusive. As shown in the attached photographs, the present flat roof sits beneath my main sightline and does not dominate the view from either my house or garden.

The proposed pitched roof would substantially increase the overall height and massing of the building and would project directly into the area of sky and outlook that is currently open. This would transform a modest ancillary structure into a dominant and imposing feature immediately adjacent to my boundary.

While I understand that loss of a private view is not a planning consideration, the proposal would result in a clear and demonstrable loss of outlook and would create an oppressive sense of enclosure where none presently exists. The change from flat to pitched roof is the key factor that materially worsens the impact of the scheme.

2. Unacceptable Sense of Enclosure

At present there is an open aspect beyond my rear boundary. The revised design would replace this with a tall, pitched roof structure that would dominate the outlook from both my garden and the rear-facing rooms of my property.

The increased height and bulk would fundamentally alter the spatial relationship between the two properties, creating a walled-in effect and a significant reduction in the quality of amenity I currently enjoy.

3. Overlooking and Loss of Privacy

The revised plans appear to introduce windows at an elevated level which would have direct sightlines into my private rear garden and potentially into rear-facing rooms of my home.

This would represent a material loss of privacy. The application does not demonstrate any adequate mitigation measures such as obscure glazing, restricted openings, or alternative window positioning. Without such safeguards, the proposal would unacceptably erode my existing level of privacy.

4. Character, Design, and Consistency with Surrounding Development

The move from a flat roof to a pitched roof is not in keeping with the established pattern of development in the immediate vicinity.

I have attached a photograph showing the adjoining neighbouring property, which has a flat roof extension over the garage. This demonstrates that the prevailing and established form along this boundary is low-level, flat-roofed structures.

The proposed pitched roof would therefore be visually inconsistent with what is already present and would introduce a form of development that is out of character with the surrounding properties. It would appear incongruous and overly dominant when compared to the existing neighbouring extensions.

5. Scale and Massing

The revised pitched roof design represents a substantial increase in scale and bulk compared with the existing structure. The resulting form would be considerably larger and more visually intrusive, fundamentally altering the character of the relationship between the two properties.

6. Reference to Historic Planning Permission (1981)

I note that the application references a planning permission granted in 1981 for a similar form of development. I would respectfully point out that this permission was never implemented and has therefore long since expired.

As such, it carries no legal weight in the determination of the current application. Planning policy, design standards, and expectations regarding neighbour amenity have changed significantly over the past four decades. The present proposal must therefore be assessed entirely on its own merits against current planning policies and the existing site circumstances.

Furthermore, the current scheme – particularly the revised pitched roof design – appears materially different from any historic approval. It should not be assumed that what may have been considered acceptable in 1981 remains appropriate today.

Request for Site Visit

As the directly affected neighbour, I respectfully request that the case officer undertakes a site visit and views the relationship from within my property and garden before any decision is made. I believe this is essential to fully appreciate the overbearing and enclosing impact that the revised design would create.

Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above, I ask that this application be refused in its current form.

If officers are minded to approve the application, I would request that the following amendments are required as a minimum:

- Retention of the originally proposed flat roof design
- A reduction in overall height and bulk
- Removal or relocation of windows that would cause overlooking
- Imposition of appropriate privacy conditions such as obscure glazing and restricted openings

I trust that these concerns will be fully taken into account when determining the application.