

Mr & Mrs M Cox
Beechmount
Stoney Lane
Endon
Stoke-on-Trent
ST9 9BX

20 July 2024

Planning Team
Staffordshire Moorlands District Council
Moorlands House
Stockwell Street
Leek
Staffordshire
ST13 6HQ

Dear Sirs

OBJECTION TO SMD/2024/0296 Mr Steven Shenton Rose Hill Stoney Lane Endon

We own and live in the semi-detached house adjoining Rose Hill with our family. Both houses were built around 1873 on a private lane. Our property faces north while Rose Hill faces south. The proposed extension is to the rear of our house and would have a significant adverse impact on our enjoyment of and amenity to our house and our rights to light.

We were not consulted about the design of the proposed extension at Rose Hill in advance of the planning application being submitted and did not have an opportunity to discuss the impact on our house. As a result, we have to object to the planning application on the following grounds:

Loss of daylight

The proposed two storey extension would substantially obstruct the light entering the ground floor windows of our house. As most of our house is north facing, any loss of light to the windows on the rear of our house, which receive the most natural light to our living space, would adversely impact our living environment, property value, and the well-being of occupants. The proposed extension would reduce the light currently received to below the minimum level of natural illumination and we would

have to use artificial light. All six windows and two sets of patio doors on our rear elevation are currently unobstructed by any part of the Rose Hill and receive light. The proposed extension would block light to all of the ground floor windows and patio doors (including to our kitchen and a living room) and obstruct some of the light to the three first floor windows. This would necessitate having lighting on throughout the day to use the affected rooms on the ground floor. The applicant did not submit a Daylight and Sunlight Assessment with the application and we ask that one is provided by the applicant before a decision is made.

We have a legal right to light over Rose Hill that we would seek to protect if the application was granted.

Overbearing impact and loss of amenity

A two storey extension of this size would be overbearing. Currently, there is a small single storey extension at the back of Rose Hill which does not impose or overbear. The proposed extension is four times the size and would have a detrimental impact on the amenity of our house. Due to the levels of the ground, the single storey element of the proposed extension would be at a greater height than the ground floor of our house and although single storey, would overbear to a greater extent than a single storey building on the same level. The two storey element and the single storey element are also stepped in closer to our boundary wall. As proposed, the extension would remove our view of woodland adjoining Rose Hill and sky that we currently enjoy. Photos are attached showing the current view which will be completely obscured. They also give a sense of the loss of light that would be felt.

The proposed extension is to be built close to our boundary, only approximately 2 metres away, directly overlooks our house and does not provide the minimum separation distance at ground or second floor, including habitable rooms (kitchen, living room). Yet, it is possible for the extension to have been built much further away from our boundary wall given the extensive garden area to the side of Rose Hill and if that had been the case, would have a much reduced impact on our house and our amenity.

The design of the proposed extension as it faces our house is not in keeping with the design of our house or Rose Hill which are Victorian Villas. It has a modern façade which is out of character. It has windows overlooking our house, including our kitchen, living room, bathroom, toilet and bedroom, giving rise to an unacceptable loss of privacy.

Paragraph 130 of the NPPF sets out six criteria against which planning policies and decisions should meet and this includes creating places with a high standard of amenity for existing users. This proposed extension does not provide our house with a high standard of amenity and reduces much of the amenity that we have.

My husband and I both work from home and so will be impacted to a greater degree.

We would ask that you give consideration to our objection and bring it to the attention of the Planning Applications Committee and request that the application for planning permission is refused.

We would be happy to discuss an alternative design with the applicant which would minimise the impact on our house. Until around 3 years ago, there was a single storey extension with a flat roof which has been largely demolished and part left with a pitch roof. Replicating the flat roof extension would be acceptable as it did not interfere with our rights of light to such a degree that the proposed two storey extension would.

We would be happy to host a visit to our property should you or the committee wish to see the impact the proposed extension would have.

Your sincerely



Michael and Jane Cox

10 pages – photos follow



Photo taken from our living room – the proposed extension would block most of the trees



Photo take from our kitchen – the two storey extension would block out the trees on the left and middle of this photo and you can see how there is not a huge amount of natural light to our house



Photo showing the footprint of the part extension that was demolished and our backyard and roof of our house on the bottom right corner– the proposed extension would be closer to our house and the footprint of the demolished extension



Photo taken from our first floor bedroom of the existing single storey extension at Rose Hill – the proposed extension would be another storey in height than the existing extension and would block out all of the trees that you can see



Existing single storey extension from our first floor bedroom – our bedroom window is level with the first storey extension so a two storey extension would be much higher and the top of the roof of the proposed extension would be as high as the top of the middle window to the left of the photo



Photo of Rose Hill showing the extent of the garden area that an extension could be built in away from our house



This photo shows the sunlight and all of the view of trees above the garden wall would be blocked out