Reference: **H16-0829-15**

Applicant: **Mr N Rangeley**

36 West Parade

Spalding

Lincs PE11 1HD

Dear sir

Further to the recent refusal of the above planning application and subsequent discussions with Mr Richard Fiddler please find below my reasons for resubmitting the application as advised.

This is an application for the erection of a two storey rear extension to our property.

The neighbouring property to the north, a dormer bungalow at 38 West Parade is 4.1m from our property.



The window facing the proposed development is that of a small kitchen, which has a glass internal door leading to a conservatory at the rear of the property. There is no room in the kitchen for a dining table and would suggest that this room could only ever be used as a space for preparation of food and not an 'habitable' room.





Currently the outlook from the kitchen is that of a 6' high wooden fence (new fence put in place in 2014 replacing an old 7' fence that was covered in Ivy). The proposed extension would not be overbearing to number 38. The owner of 38 West Parade has no objection to the extension.

The 45 degree test is shown in the supporting information on 9/10/15 is clearly passed. As the distance between properties is 4.1m there will be no significant impact on loss of light and would not be overbearing.

Having looked around the local area there are two recent/current developments that would set a precedent for building development close to windows on neighbouring properties. These being **H16-0967-09** at 48 Park Road Spalding and **H16-0386-15** at 129 Pennygate. The application on Park Road shows the new property being built in very close proximity to a bay window on the neighbouring property. The application on Pennygate mentions loss of light and being overbearing but states that they are considered acceptable when the property is much closer than in my application. This highlights an inconsistency in considering my application.

I look forward to a positive outcome.

Nick Rangeley

6/12/15