

20250813 25/02047/FPH (Summerhouse extension Planning Amendment)

We object to the summerhouse extension and modification to the original structure as built as it is not in keeping with the surrounding area, resembling a mobile home due to the materials used, and because of the potential impact on our property including the adjacent structure on our land. The summerhouse has not been built according to the approved plans; the fundamental differences described below would have caused us to raise an objection if they had been revealed at the planning stage.

The application FPH-Application Forms-04032025.pdf states that no trees or hedges were to be removed or pruned. This is factually incorrect as an elderflower tree was removed from the area between the summer house and east boundary.

There are significant differences between the previous submitted plans 25/00599/FPH and the retrospective submission 25/02047/FPH. Of particular importance are the values of the distance between the summer house and the boundaries. This was stated as 1m at closest distance to the eastern and northern boundaries in 25/00599/FPH and became 0.852m and 0.830m in 25/02047/FPH, respectively. We are concerned over the accuracy of these figures and believe the gap pertaining to the eastern boundary is approximately 0.75m with the current construction. We were not given the required opportunity to comment on and/or object to the construction at this distance as the plans submitted indicated that it would be larger. This reduced separation means that the impact on our property is not the same as for the previously submitted and approved plans and we now object. Also, the original plan was for a building that was rendered to match the main dwelling, and to be sympathetic with it in terms of shape and materials. The constructed summer house is faced with horizontal weather board that is not sympathetic at all with the main dwelling or the surrounding area. This combines with the large aspect of the extended building and its proximity to the boundary to make it imposing in appearance and to exacerbate its out of character nature.

The drainage from the constructed building is a concern as there is a single down pipe at its south-east corner. This drains (photo) via a water butt onto the ground between the summer house and the east boundary. Contrary to Building Regulations Approved Document H3 on drainage, we believe that the ground has been covered with gravel, but no soakaway was installed. Given the size of the roof, this suggests that the area between the summer house and the adjacent garage risks getting heavily loaded with water which, making damp, risks creating structural issues to both properties and creates the potential for flooding of our garden. We suggest drainage calculations and rainwater drainage compliance details be considered in the review of this application



Summer house drainage, taken 21/9/25.

For these reasons the changes to the construction are not minor amendments, but fundamental changes affecting neighbour amenity and we object to the building.

Further, the plan FPH-Plans-13082025(2).pdf suggests that the timber shed is largely away from the north boundary fence, which is not owned by the property. We don't believe this to be accurate. Rather, the shed roof abuts the fence along its length, and we expect rain will drain directly onto the fence.



Lean-to shed at the back of the summer house, overhanging fence. Taken 21/9/25.

Due to inconsistencies in the measurements between the original proposed and agreed plans, and our own evidence (see photos) we suggest a professional survey be conducted.

Works began with the installation of scaffolding on 6th May for the removal of the chimney, with associated internal works, amendments to the front, back and summer house all occurring subsequently as a coherent program of work. We are concerned that the cumulative group of significant works (25/00599/FPH, 25/02045/FPH and 25/02047/FPH) proceeded without accurate planning requests, statutory consultation and proper

permissions and can only conclude that there has been a deliberate attempt to avoid proper processes and to present both neighbours and authorities with a fait accompli.