

I wish to object only to the proposed roof/loft extension at No. 18 Holm Oaks.

I have no objection to the proposed lower ground-floor side extension or the garage rear extension, provided these elements are constructed strictly in accordance with the plans submitted within this application dated 12/04/26 and that no material alterations are made from the approved design.

My objection relates specifically to the proposed loft/dormer extension, which I consider to be overly dominant and overbearing in both scale and appearance. The proposed black zinc finish is not in keeping with the character of the surrounding area and would appear visually intrusive, resembling a steel site cabin placed on top of the existing building.

In addition, the position of No. 18, which sits at slightly less than a 90-degree angle to No. 19, means that the proposed extension would materially affect the outlook from both my lounge and master bedroom. The development would also result in a significant loss of privacy. No. 19 was purchased in part due to its private aspect and limited overlooking from neighbouring properties.

Furthermore, the submitted drawings do not accurately reflect the existing arrangement at No. 19, which already benefits from a side lounge extension constructed prior to my ownership. The applicant's reliance on a 45-degree viewing angle is therefore misleading and immaterial in this case, as there would be no effective restriction on overlooking from the proposed window. Given that the extension would be an additional storey higher, direct views into both the master bedroom and ground floor lounge of No. 19 would be possible, resulting in an unacceptable level of overlooking and loss of residential amenity.

Should the application be approved, I would also request that a condition be imposed restricting site working hours, with no weekend working permitted, in order to protect the quiet and peaceful character of this residential close.



The continued references to No.24 Holm Oaks in the Ellisdon Architectural Associates Planning Statement is irrelevant as No.24 is set back from the adjacent dwellings (see photo) which all face the same way towards the back woods and has no visual impact on any of the adjacent dwellings or imposes any privacy issues either and as such SHOULD NOT be taken into account and presumed as a done deal!.

The proposed roof extension at No. 18 would affect neighbouring properties, particularly No. 19. Although it is level with, or slightly below, the existing ridge height, it is not in keeping with the proportions or character of the host dwelling.

The loft conversion is not acceptable as it produces material harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and neighbouring amenity.

Ellisdon Architectural Associates Planning Statement.

Executive position. The central planning point is straightforward: the Planning Inspector has already accepted, within the same Holm Oaks estate and under the same historic restriction removing permitted development rights, that a substantial rear roof extension can be acceptable where it is rear-facing, set below the ridge, read in the context of the dwelling, and only very limitedly perceived from the public realm. The present proposal at No. 18 engages the same core considerations. The single-storey extensions are plainly subordinate and acceptable. The loft conversion and rear dormer are also acceptable because they do not produce material harm to the character or appearance of the host dwelling, the wider street scene, or neighbouring amenity. The appeal at No. 24 is not merely background history: it is a powerful material consideration which points firmly towards approval here.

Location of No.24 Holm Oaks against adjacent properties



The proposed roof / loft extension of No.18 is extremely bulky, and should this be under consideration of approval suggest that the side walls are set in a minimum of 1m from the flank walls and reduced in depth by at least 1.5m from the eaves. This would make this dormer less imposing and more sympathetically designed. To avoid any potential overlooking suggest that window nearest to my property No.19 has the window opener / hinge on the left looking onto it. This should limit visibility to the right when open. This window will need to be a fire escape window so will need a reasonable size opener. A more sympathetic finish must be considered possibly cladding or tile hanging?

Alternatively, flip the layout at the upper floor so that the bathroom is that end and has a frosted glass finish.

Should the case officer wish to visit my property at No. 19 in order to fully assess the impact of the application, they would be more than welcome to do so.

As initially stated, I have no objections to the proposed side/rear extension or the garage rear extension.