

From: nicollette zarka [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 July 2026 00:06
To: Thomas Howe [REDACTED]
Subject: 8 Gibson Close 26/01415/FPH

Re: Planning Application 26/01415/FPH – [8 Gibson Close, Hitchin](#)

Dear Mr Howe,

Thank you for your letter dated 16 June.

I wish to submit the following comments in respect of the above planning application and respectfully request that they are considered when determining the application.

My concerns relate primarily to the impact that the proposed development would have on the residential amenity of my property, No. 7 Gibson Close. I understand that the proposal will be assessed against the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and the relevant policies of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan. I respectfully ask the Council to consider whether the proposal is consistent with the aims of Policies SP9 (Design and Sustainability), D1 (Sustainable Design) and D3 (Protecting Living Conditions), having regard to the impact that the development would have on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

Prior to the submission of this application, the applicants initially indicated that they intended to construct a single-storey rear extension on the side nearest to my property at No. 7, whilst locating a two-storey extension on the side nearest to No. 9. It was only after discussion with their architect that they indicated amendment to plans and to pursue a two-storey extension across the full width of the rear of the property.

Whilst applicants are entitled to amend their proposals prior to submission, I consider the evolution of the scheme to be highly relevant to the assessment of its impact. The fact that the originally envisaged arrangement comprised only a single-storey extension adjacent to my property at No. 7, with the two-storey element positioned on the opposite side nearest No. 9, suggests a clear recognition that the relationship with No. 7 is more sensitive in planning terms.

In my view, the original proposal reflected a reasonable appreciation of the constraints arising from the proximity of the shared boundary, the orientation of the properties and the potential effects on neighbouring residential amenity. The fact that the applicants' original concept avoided a two-storey element adjacent to No. 7 is, in my view, not merely a design preference but an acknowledgement of the sensitivity of this boundary.

1. Loss of Light and Overbearing Impact

The proposed two-storey extension would have a significant impact on the enjoyment of my home and garden. Due to its height and position immediately adjacent to our shared boundary, I

believe it would create an overbearing sense of enclosure and lead to a noticeable reduction in both daylight and sunlight reaching my property and rear garden.

A particularly important consideration in this case is that the proposed extension would be constructed on the eastern side of my property. Therefore, it would sit directly between my home and the morning sun. This is the side from which sunlight currently reaches both my garden and principal living accommodation during the early part of the day. The location of the extension therefore makes it especially sensitive in terms of its effect on daylight, sunlight and residential amenity.

The proposal would fundamentally alter the current open outlook enjoyed from both my house and garden.

My garden is south-east facing and the proposed extension would be positioned along its eastern boundary. The morning sun rises to the east and currently reaches my property through the relatively open space that exists between the two houses. The proposed two-storey extension would introduce a substantial built form into this area and would inevitably interrupt part of that natural path of sunlight.

As a result, there would be a reduction in the amount of morning sunlight reaching both my garden and my home. The impact would be particularly noticeable because the extension would be located precisely on the side from which this sunlight is received. In contrast, if the extension is single storey in accordance with the applicants' earlier indication, the effect on sunlight penetration would be considerably less significant.

Our principal living room and rear patio doors currently benefit from this morning sunlight due to the open aspect that exists between the properties. This is the only principal living room within our home and it is located immediately adjacent to the proposed extension. Any reduction in natural light would therefore have a direct effect on the enjoyment and day-to-day use of our main living accommodation. The proposal would also reduce the light and outlook available to our second bedroom.

The patio forms the principal seating and recreational area of our garden and is located immediately adjacent to the proposed extension. The extension would project approximately four metres beyond the rear wall of my property and beyond the full length of our existing patio. As a result, the area of the garden most frequently used by my family would be directly affected by increased overshadowing, loss of light and a much greater sense of enclosure.

The neighbouring property is not set further back than my own, unlike many properties in Gibson Close which are staggered. This means the relationship between the proposed extension and my property is particularly direct and its visual and physical presence would be more apparent.

Whilst I appreciate that some impact may be inevitable when neighbouring properties are extended, it is important to distinguish between the principle of extending a property and the scale of the extension proposed in this case. Had the proposal remained as a single-storey extension adjacent to my property, I do not believe the impact would be of the same magnitude. It is the addition of a second storey, particularly on the side closest to my property and from

which our home and garden receive morning sunlight, that gives rise to the concerns set out in this objection.

2. Effect on Outlook

From my observations of the surrounding properties in Gibson Close, the relationship proposed in this application appears unusual. I have not identified any comparable example where a substantial two-storey rear extension is positioned immediately adjacent to the eastern boundary of a neighbouring property in a manner that would have a similar effect on outlook, enclosure and the receipt of morning sunlight.

Whilst each application must be considered on its own merits, the relative absence of similar relationships within the immediate area suggests that the form, scale and positioning of the proposed extension may be out of keeping with the established pattern of development and the relationship generally found between neighbouring properties in the Close.

This is particularly relevant given that the applicants' original indication differentiated between the two sides of the property by limiting the extension adjacent to No. 7 to a single storey. The submitted scheme removes that distinction and introduces a substantial two-storey built form in what appears to be the most sensitive location in terms of outlook, enclosure and access to morning sunlight.

The scale, height and proximity of the extension would significantly change the outlook from both my house and garden, replacing the current open aspect with a substantial two-storey structure immediately adjacent to the shared boundary and extending beyond the full length of my patio.

The visual impact would be particularly noticeable from our principal living accommodation and patio area, both of which currently benefit from an openness that contributes significantly to the enjoyment of our home. The proposed extension would introduce a prominent two-storey built form adjacent to the boundary, substantially replacing the current open outlook and creating a far more dominant relationship between the two properties than currently exists.

3. Accuracy of the Plans and Daylight Assessment

I would respectfully ask that it is checked that the Council's 45-degree guideline, or any equivalent daylight assessment used by the Council, has been measured correctly.

The dimensions shown on the submitted plans appear, from my own observations, to differ from those that exist on site. I would therefore be grateful if the measurements used within any daylight assessment or 45-degree assessment could be independently verified before a decision is reached.

4. Residential Amenity

In considering whether the proposal would be consistent with the relevant planning policies relating to design and residential amenity, I respectfully ask the Council to give careful consideration to the following effects on my property:

- Loss of daylight and sunlight;
- The overbearing impact of the proposed two-storey wall;
- Loss of openness and outlook from my property and garden;
- The impact on the enjoyment and usability of the patio area immediately adjoining the extension;
- The reduction in morning sunlight reaching my home and garden;
- The reduction in natural light levels within my principal living accommodation;
- The effect on the outlook from our second bedroom; and
- Whether the scale, height and massing of the extension are proportionate within the context of the surrounding properties.

It is also unclear to me as to whether it is proposed that there are dormer windows in the roof. If so and if a single storey is considered by the council I ask that the council considers whether this would overlook my garden such that it affects privacy. I also note that a side window is suggested to which I would not object, if single storey, if frosted glass is used although I don't understand why a window to the garden rather than the side would not allow sufficient light into the proposed new room.

I fully recognise that householders have the right to extend their homes. However, that right must be balanced against the effect of development on neighbouring occupiers.

In my view, the applicants' original indication, which limited the extension adjacent to No. 7 to a single storey, represented a more proportionate response to the constraints of the site. That approach would allow the applicants to extend their home whilst materially reducing the adverse effects on neighbouring amenity.

The concerns set out in this objection arise not from the principle of extending the property, but from the decision to introduce a substantial two-storey element on the side nearest my living room and patio.

The significance of the impact is increased by the fact that the proposed two-storey extension would be located on the eastern side of my property, directly affecting the route by which morning sunlight reaches both my home and garden.

For the reasons outlined above, I respectfully ask the Council to consider whether the proposal is consistent with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies.

I therefore respectfully request that the Council considers these concerns when determining the application and considers whether the proposal satisfactorily balances the applicants' desire to extend their home with the need to protect the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

Should the Council conclude that the proposal would result in undue harm to neighbouring amenity, I would respectfully ask that permission be refused or that amendments be sought to address those impacts. I would ask the Council to consider whether a single-storey extension adjacent to No. 7 would represent a more proportionate solution that better respects the relationship between the two properties whilst still allowing the applicants to extend their home.

Thank you for taking the time to consider. I would be grateful if you could acknowledge receipt of this email.

Yours Sincerely,

Nicolette Zarka

[7 Gibson Close Hitchin](#)