

Joshua Lee

From: PETER SOLOMON <peter.solomon3@ntlworld.com>
Sent: 05 June 2023 14:41
To: Joshua Lee
Subject: Objection Letter (Planning Application Number 136953/FH/2023)
Attachments: 4 Sark Road-3.pdf; No. 4 Sark Road Planning objections 3.docx

You don't often get email from peter.solomon3@ntlworld.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Manchester City Council	Peter and Jenny Solomon
Planning	4 Sark Road
Joshua Lee	Chorlton cum Hardy
Level 6 Town Hall Extension	Manchester
P O Box 532 Manchester M60 2LA	M21 9NT

5th June 2023

Dear Mr Lee

Planning Application Number 136953/FH/2023

Erection of a first floor side extension to form additional living accommodation at 6 Sark Road Chorlton-cum-Hardy Manchester M21 9NT

(please see attached: Assessment of daylight/sunlight and Overshadowing Survey by Martin Carroll Architectural Services)

For 35 years, we have lived at No.4 Sark Road, have raised our children there, and wish to continue our lives there. However, the above planning application puts at risk crucial residential amenities upon which our quality of life at home is based, therefore:

We strongly object to the proposed first floor side extension for the following reasons.

The proposed development by reason of its size, height, proximity, massing and loss of daylight and sunlight would represent an overbearing and oppressive over-development, which would impact the existing amenities of nearby neighbours, namely that of No. 4 Sark Road, in the following way:

Overshadowing

Loss of Daylight and Sunlight

Overbearing Effect

Outlook

Proximity

(All references below in *italics* are from National or Local Authority planning Guidelines.)

Overshadowing

The development would not provide sufficient outlook and natural lighting levels thereby causing significant overshadowing and enclosure. (see attached: **Assessment of daylight/sunlight and Overshadowing Survey**).

Daylight/Sunlight Assessment

“If a development is likely to significantly reduce the amount of daylight or sunlight to a habitable room or result in a significant overbearing impact on a neighbour, an assessment of daylight, sunlight and overshadowing should be undertaken, using computer software to measure the amount of daylight and sunlight that is available to windows in a number of neighbouring buildings. (Manchester Core Strategy Planning Policy DM1 and EN2)”

This assessment has been undertaken by **Martin Carroll Architectural Services** on our Behalf (see attached **Assessment of daylight/sunlight and Overshadowing Survey**.) The results of this assessment show significant overshadowing, and one significant finding states that:

“With the proposed first floor extension, every day of the year has an element of overshadowing of the kitchen window at No. 4. Whereas without the proposed first floor extension there are around 110 days without overshadowing.”

Loss of Daylight and Sunlight

“When assessing how a development proposal may impact on the existing amenity of an area and living conditions of nearby occupiers, the following issues would be significant.

A new residential building or an extension to an existing one should not cause significant harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residents when using their gardens or habitable rooms.”

The overbearing and oppressive effects of over-development.

The scale of the development and its proximity right along the boundary of No. 4 Sark Road results in an oppressive environment.

The development would not provide sufficient outlook and natural lighting levels thereby causing significant overshadowing and enclosure. (see attached: Assessment of daylight/sunlight and Overshadowing Survey.)

The overbearing impacts caused by the physical 'presence' of the of the second storey extension, its scale and mass, would lead to an oppressive environment. The result of the extension would be permanently intrusive. Therefore the proposals would result in a permanent overbearing impact on the residential amenity of nearby neighbours, namely No. 4 Sark Road, and planning permission should therefore be refused.

Natural Light and Outlook

"The following, on natural light and outlook is also particularly relevant to understanding and assessing an overbearing impact.

When a development has a prejudicial impact on natural light and outlook it is highly likely that the development would also be considered overbearing.

For the purposes of assessing the impacts of development on residential amenity 'outlook' is taken to mean what you look out on to, such as the prospect from a window.

'Natural light' refers to the amount of ambient light that enters a room from all directions during the course of a day.

*Natural light is important to residential amenity because it makes a home a pleasant and healthy place in which to live in. Development should aim to **ensure that every house receives the maximum natural light throughout the year.**"*

Outlook

With a separation distance of only 2.5m between the proposed extension and the kitchen window at No.4, the blank side wall elevation is likely to become the dominant and overbearing feature to the detriment of amenity. The outlook would be bleak!

"As with natural light, outlook is important as a dwelling without an outlook is an undesirable place to live. Development which results in prejudicial harm to the outlook of a residential property will not be considered to reach the highest possible standards of design. As a result it is more likely such proposals will be resisted."

Proximity

"1. RESIDENTIAL EXTENSIONS

.....2DC1.1 In determining planning applications for extensions to residential properties, the Council will have regard to:

- 1. the general character of the property;*
- 2. the effect upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers;*

DC1.b. they do not create an undue loss of sunlight, daylight or privacy;

As a guide, and without prejudice to the generality of this policy, the Council will normally permit 2-storey house extensions which, when built, would leave a minimum of 1.52m (5 ft) between the side wall and the common boundary, and which meet the other requirements of this policy. Proposals which cannot meet these requirements will be judged on their merits, but with weight being given to (a) and (c) above.” (Manchester Citywide Development Control Policies. Extant Unitary Development Policies (UDP) The Core Strategy replaced much of the UDP but some UDP policies are extant (remain). You can see them here.)

http://www.manchester.gov.uk/downloads/download/4975/extant_udp_policies

This development conclusively fails to achieve this minimum separation, as the distance from the wall of the development and the common boundary with No.4 is only 20 centimetres, not anywhere near the 1.52m recommended by the guidance. Also it would create a significant loss of sunlight and daylight and will have a detrimental effect on neighbours' amenities. Therefore this proposed development should not be approved

Window-to-Wall Test

“The window-to-wall test protects natural light and outlook. Where a window to a primary room faces onto the blank elevation of another building, a separation distance of 12 metres should be maintained. Where a separation distance of 12 metres or over is achieved, it is unlikely that development would provide insufficient levels of natural light or outlook.

Where a development would result in a two storey side wall of a building being too close to a main elevation of a dwelling with windows, it will normally cause a significant loss of light or overbearing impact for the occupants of that dwelling. Therefore a distance of at least 12 metres should be maintained.

*Developments that result in a distance of less than 12 metres will normally result in a significant loss of light and overbearing impact and in such circumstances **should be refused planning permission**”.*

This development very clearly fails this test as the distance between the kitchen window at No.4 Sark Road and the blank elevation wall of the proposed extension is only 2.5 metres, thus causing “loss of light and overbearing impact”.

Conclusion

If there were any doubts about the effects of the proposed development, then a quick look at the attached **survey of daylight/sunlight and overshadowing, from Martin Carroll Architectural Services**, shows in detail the extent of the clearly detrimental overshadowing that would be imposed upon us, leading to a permanent and extremely overbearing effect. **For us, the extension would lead to a very significant loss of natural daylight and sunlight, and an overall sense of drastic and permanent reduction in our quality of life and our day-to-day residential amenities.**

The proposed first floor side-extension at No. 6 will be ALMOST RIGHT UP AGAINST THE BOUNDARY FENCE. The view from our kitchen window would thus be of a large expanse of blank brick wall only 2.5m away, resulting in permanent and significant loss of natural daylight and sunlight and after being accustomed to this amenity for 35 years it seems unfair and it would definitely feel overshadowing (**see attached assessment and survey, which**

clearly illustrates the comprehensive extent of the overshadowing.) The result would be an overbearing and permanent uncomfortable feeling of enclosure.

To go from our present 110 days without any overshadowing, to the post-development situation of zero days without overshadowing, that is drastic loss of amenity.

We would stress again our sincere and strong objections to the proposed first floor side extension which would be significantly and PERMANENTLY detrimental to our quality of life and residential amenities.

It seems clear to us that for all the reasons above, including the failure to follow a number of Manchester City Council's and National planning Policy principles, the natural outcome would be for this planning application to be refused.

Peter Solomon

Jenny Solomon