

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Wednesday, January 15, 2025 5:46 PM  
To: Development Control <developmentcontrol@derby.gov.uk>  
Cc: [REDACTED]  
Subject: Objection

[REDACTED]  
Derby City Council  
15/01/25

Objection to 157 Rykneld Road, Derby, DE23 4AL Ref no : 24/01779/FUL

[REDACTED] and object on the following basis :

- 1 - The length of the extension
- 2 - The height of the extension
- 3 - The 45 Degree Rule - right of light
- 4 - The destruction of the boundary hedge

1 - The projection from the original rear wall is far too long. 8.7 metres causing an impact on light in the house and shadowing of the outdoor amenity space and garden.

The 3 metre permitted development ( conservatory ) has already caused an impact on light [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] The extra length will be overwhelming and claustrophobic giving the feeling of a prison wall from the seating of [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

2 - The height of the roof will be higher than now to comply with insulation regulations for flat roofs causing more complications for light entering the living room

3 - The 45 Degree Rule and right of light in your living accommodation. The conservatory building has already taken in the 45 degrees from the French door and windows of the lounge. The extra 5.7 metres will also impact the light entering the kitchen and have an impact on the outdoor amenity space and garden

4 - The destruction of some of the shared boundary hedge.

In the submitted plans it says that NO trees or hedges will be removed HOW is this so when they need the boundary line for the wall of the extension

Yours faithfully

[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 15, 2025 5:07 PM  
**To:** Development Control <developmentcontrol@derby.gov.uk>; [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Planning Application 24/01779/FUL

Dear [REDACTED],  
Please below details of my objection to the above planning application at 157 Rykneld Road,  
Littleover. Derby. DE23 4AL

The overall projection of the extension is 8.7m from the original rear wall and in proportion to the front to back of the original house effectively doubles the length of the property which is too long when "permitted development" is 3m.  
The length is more than 45 Degrees Rule allows and will have an overbearing impact on the view, right of light and over [shadow](#) the property..

The proposed extension would involve removing the shared hedge, which on the plans states that no hedge will be removed. [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] if the application proceeds these views will disappear whilst also having an overbearing impact on [REDACTED] amenity space, view and light.

The flat roof height of the extension is detailed on the planning application at 3.03 metres, considerably higher than currently existing 2.7m height which slopes backwards from the existing extension. There is also some suggestion that the roof may go an extra 40cm higher due to additional insulation require to conform to current building regulations making the proposed extension higher.

Taking into consideration the height and length of the proposed extension I firmly believe it would have a profound and overbearing effect of looking at a very long and high brick wall, giving a negative and detrimental environment .

Yours faithfully

[REDACTED]

**Application No:** 157 Rykneld Road Derby DE23 4AL  
**Location:** 157 Rykneld Road  
Derby  
DE23 4AL  
**Proposal:** Single storey rear extension to dwelling house (bedroom)

### **Neighbour Comments**

**These are the [REDACTED] comments submitted via the eplanning service:**

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**Stance:** O - Objection

**Comment:**

I wish to object to planning application 24/01779/FUL for the following reasons:

Latest Neighbour Consultation Date is shown on the Planning Portal as Monday, 23 December 2024. First contact with [REDACTED] from 157 Rykneld Road (157) over proposal was 28 December 2024 which was after the plans had been submitted. This was the first that 155 knew of the plans.

Notification from Derby City Council was also delayed due to Christmas and was received by 155 on Monday, 30 December 2024.

This has reduced the amount of time that 155 has to respond to the plans.

#### **Application Form - Section 7 - Trees and Hedges**

Current boundary is a hedge which has been in place since the houses were built and may (or may not) need to be removed. There are also historical fruit trees in the gardens of [REDACTED] and 157 that may be within falling distance of the proposed development. Applicant has indicated that the hedge won't be removed and that there is no risk from trees to the proposal.

Lack of consistency shown between Proposed Ground Floor Plan and Extension and the Proposed Site Plan. Application form indicates that the hedge would not be removed but that isn't consistent with the Proposed Site Plan.

#### **Existing Site Plan**

The tree that is shown in the garden in 157 is shown as being near the end of the garden. The tree is actually half-way down the garden and therefore closer to the proposed extension than shown and may be within falling distance of the proposed extension.

#### **Proposed Ground Floor Plan and Elevation**

Incorrect label on the plans. Existing Southwest Elevation is actually the Proposed Southwest Elevation

There are no dimensions on the drawings. [REDACTED] is therefore unable to determine the height, length or width of the proposed extension and how that would affect [REDACTED]. There is also no indication of the proposed rainwater and waste water management and how extraction from the bathroom will be managed.

There is also no indication of whether the existing conservatory will be extended or demolished.

This plan shows the extension being built directly on the boundary line which is not consistent with the Proposed Site Plan where the hedge is still shown. There is currently no agreement in place for 157 to be able to access the extension from 155 for maintenance.

It is clear from the plans that the proposed 157 extension would have an overbearing presence on the [REDACTED] and have an impact on the right to light. [REDACTED] already has limited light in the rear room caused by the existing conservatory and this much longer extension will exacerbate the lack of light.

#### Proposed Site Plan

This shows the boundary hedge still in place and extension being constructed behind the boundary hedge. That is inconsistent with the Proposed Ground Floor Plan and Elevation. [REDACTED] would be keen for the existing hedge to be retained and for the extension not to be built directly on the boundary.

-----



**Stance:** O - Objection

**Comment:**

I object to planning application 24/01779/FUL. The submitted plans relating to 157 Rykneld Road are incomplete/incorrect.

These plans contain no dimensions. To understand the size and scale of the proposed development dimensions were required. The Proposed Ground Floor Plan & Elevation is inaccurate, the view of the 'Existing Southwest Elevation' should be labelled proposed.

The Applicant indicates the privet hedge will not be removed; this has been in situ 65yrs+. However, one drawing shows the boundary hedge whilst one drawing shows no hedge?

The location of the pear tree in 157's garden is substantially closer than the tree marked on the plans. It is likely within striking distance of the proposed new build as is a much taller pear tree located in the garden of [REDACTED]

Due the plans lacking dimensions, Architect copies were sourced containing dimensions. These lead to the following objections.

The size of the proposed development will have a significant and detrimental impact on the property of [REDACTED]. The length of the new extension incorporating existing conservatory is 10.82m which is longer than the length of the main house (11m), and totally out of proportion.

The existing conservatory wall is 2.00m high with 750cm of glass panels above. If the new wall is built up with bricks to 3.03m and 10.82m long there will be a huge loss of natural light. The existing conservatory already restricts natural light. A solid brick wall 3.03m x 10.82m will deprive 155 of substantially more sun light and create a 'corridor effect' in the rear garden of 155. Such a building will impose on the enjoyment of amenities of [REDACTED].

A brick wall of 3.03m in height by 10.82m will placing the lawn in constant shade making it an un-usable space. A 3.03m wall would be higher than the current privet hedge of 2.70m which lets light through whereas a wall will not. The proposed development contravenes the '450 Right to Light' from [REDACTED]'s lounge due to the excessive wall length and height.

The Plans indicate the exterior (boundary) wall being constructed exactly on the boundary (between [REDACTED] & 157) and no hedge. There will be no room for guttering, maintenance or repairs if the proposed exterior wall is built on the footings edge. No agreement exists for 157 to access the current or proposed building from [REDACTED]'s side for maintenance/ or repairs.

7m of hedge will be destroyed with a loss of wild life habitat.

The plans indicate the roof is flat; no indication is given to the management of rainwater/drainage. There is no indication of any guttering or waste soil pipes.

Latest Neighbour Consultation Date is shown on the Planning Portal as 23/12/2024. Applicant (157) only informed [REDACTED] over the proposal on 28/12/2024 after plans were submitted. This was the first that [REDACTED] knew of the plans.

DCC Planning notification was delayed due to Christmas and received by [REDACTED] on 30/12/2024, significantly reducing the time that [REDACTED] or representatives of had to source accurate plans

-----

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**Stance:** O - Objection

**Comment:**

I am writing to object to planning application 24/01779/FUL. I was informed about the proposed new build after the plans had been submitted and subsequent DCC Planning notification via post on 30th Dec, 2024 and delayed due to Christmas. I had not been informed prior to this thus significantly limiting my time in which to respond. No discussion had taken place between 157 and myself, the owner of [REDACTED].

Latest Neighbour Consultation Date is shown on the Planning Portal as 23/12/2024. Applicant

(157) only informed [REDACTED] over the proposal on 28/12/2024 after plans were submitted.

The submitted plans for 157 are sub-standard without dimensions making it impossible to appraise the size and scale. Having obtained plans with dimensions I strongly object to this development.

The current conservatory boundary wall is 3.90m long and 2m high with 75cms of windows on top (2.75m). This already deprives the rear of my property of light. The proposed boundary wall will add another 6.90m making the total length of the new build 10.82m long. The additional height of brick work proposed on top of the existing conservatory wall (removing the windows) increases the overall height to 3.03m.

A solid brick wall 10.82m long and 3.03m high will have a massive and detrimental impact on my property. It will create a tunnel/corridor effect, massively overshadow my lawn and prevent even more light entering my rear facing lounge.

Not only will it be offensive to look out upon, over 7m of longstanding privet hedge is to be destroyed in the process. I have enjoyed the hedge and wildlife it attracts for over 66 years. The proposed height exceeds the current hedge height (2.75m) and will place [REDACTED] in constant shade.

I believe contravenes my Right to Light due to the proposed new boundary wall dimensions. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] will be significantly deprived of light due to the excessive height and length of wall.

I am really concerned about the impact of four people living in a single story building adjacent to my patio/lawn. The noise from the bathroom, shower/fan and toilet flushing as well as TV's will seriously impact on the enjoyment of the amenities of 155. I will find it very difficult to sit outside, as I currently do, if facing a 10.82m x 3.03m brick wall.

Hence, the proposed new build will have a significant and detrimental impact on 155. The length of the new extension (10.82m) with conservatory is longer than the length of the main house (8.30m). This is totally out of proportion.

Plans show the exterior (boundary) wall being constructed exactly on the boundary of 155 & 157 with no hedge. The footings cannot cross the boundary line. There is no agreement in existence for 157 to access the conservatory or proposed building from [REDACTED] side for maintenance/ or repairs.

I am concerned about rain water; a flat roof will exacerbate the issue of flooding if it is not managed. There is no indication of guttering or waste soil pipes or how this will be managed.

-----

