Dear Planning Services,

I am writing to object to the planning application PP/25/00218 because it fails to comply with the 45° rule outlined in the Building Research Establishment's (BRE) guidelines, 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A guide to good practice (2022)'. This rule is a material planning consideration that aims to ensure adequate daylight and sunlight are preserved for neighbouring properties [redacted]

Attached are elevation and plan drawings annotated with the BRE guideline 45° rule line, which provide evidence of the proposed extension's impact. This shows that [redacted] falls within the proposed extension side for the 45° plan and elevation rule line planes by 0.19m (elevation) and 1.3m (plan). Using the BRE guideline above, there is not adequate light[redacted]

In addition, due to the proposed extension, [redacted] cast into shadow for much of [redacted]

The overshadowing has worsened since the proposed extension was erected in March 2025, as the proposed increase in length significantly exacerbates the issue; and results in [redacted] being inside the 45° plan rule line by 1.3m. The increase in length of the proposed extension is 1.62m (*1).

Furthermore, the planning application PP/25/00218 defines the southwest elevation of 1 Sentinel Close (faces onto Cornelius Drive) as the "front" (principal) elevation in the title of the file "PHOTOGRAPH_OF_AS_BUILT_FRONT_ELEVATION_FROM_STREET-2108453.jpg". As this is defined as the "front" elevation, the proposed extension is on the side elevation of the property. Using planning guidelines (www.planningportal.co.uk/permission/common-projects/extensions/planning-permission), for a side extension, planning consent is required if the length of a side extension is greater than half the width of the original property. The width of the original property is 3.6m as defined in the planning application, and the proposed extension length is 3.6m. Therefore the proposed length of the extension is twice the allowable permitted development length of 1.8m.

If you or the committee would like to visit [redacted] and see the loss of daylight as a result of the proposed extension, I would be very happy to arrange this.

Yours,

(*1) extension calculations for the above:

The planning application PP/25/00218 does not provide a plan for the previous extension, only a limited elevation photograph of the old extension was provided. The length and width were not provided. The height is unknown, although it looks similar to the proposed height (using the mastic wall bond marks in the application photograph).

However, the increase in length of the new extension (compared to the previous extension) can be accurately calculated using the information in the planning application.

1. Area of proposed extension is 3.6 (l) x 3.7 (w) = 13.32m2

2. Width of the previous extension is 5.4 - 0.7 = 4.7m

N.B. I have used the previous extension width as 4.7m as the vertical mastic wall bond mark on the brickwork for the previous extension can be seen in the planning application proposed extension photograph "PHOTOGRAPH_OF_SIDE_ELEVATION_PREVIOUS__REMOVED__AND_AS_BUILT-2108458,jpg". The horizontal distance from the bond line to wall edge is about 3 brick lengths plus 2x mortar head joints. For this distance 0.7m is used. Typical brick length is 215mm and head joint width is 15mm.

3. The application description states that the proposed extension footprint is a reduction of 4m2 compared to the previous extension.

Therefore, length of previous extension = area / width = (13.32 - 4) / 4.7 = 1.98m

4. Increase in length of the extension is 3.6 (proposed) - 1.98 (previous) = 1.62m