

Mr Darren Westmacott
Committee Services Officer
Legal and Domestic Services
The Moray Council
Council Offices
High Street
Elgin, IV30 1BX



5th September 2016

**Your Reference: DW/LR166 Planning Application: 16/00492/APP
Erect extension at 10 Church Place, Findhorn.**

Dear Mr Westmacott,

My main concern is with the height of the proposed extension. The roof will be almost as high as the existing roof of the terrace, and as such, my concern that it will block sunlight from my property still stands. Please see my original objection, attached.

The siting of the proposed extension is such that it would come directly between my property and the sun, at times of the year when the sun is low in the sky. As I don't get much sunlight coming into my front rooms, this could have a seriously detrimental effect.

As I see it, Mr Shand has other options and does not need to choose a design that will adversely affect neighbouring properties, in order to improve his own property.

Mr Shand has an end terrace property, with a large garden all round. He has the option to build on to the end of the terrace, and so the current proposal is not his only option.

I would find the current proposal more acceptable, were the roof to be at the same height as the bottom of the existing roof, e.g. a flat roof, or near flat roof. The roof of the proposed extension, is in my view, much higher than is necessary. It has no windows, and the extra height has apparently no purpose.

The wording of the review is misleading and obscures the facts. The extension proposed is neither small nor low pitched, as described.

3.12 Single storey low pitched extension – this is not an accurate description of the proposed plan, and is misleading. The roof of the proposed extension will be considerably higher than single storey. It will be at least two thirds the height of the existing terrace roof. And is certainly not low pitched, rather it is similar in both height and pitch to the existing terrace roof. The review claims that '*this ensures the development will not have a detrimental effect on neighbouring property*', but this claim is unsupported by the facts.

3.6 The examples in the pictures shown are not comparable examples. The proposed roof extends higher than any of the examples he is comparing it with. Their orientation north-south facing is not shown. It is impossible to tell the impact or otherwise they have on the amount of sunlight the neighbouring properties get. We do not know when these were built. It is possible they were granted permission under previously existing, different, planning rules and guidelines. It is also possible that no objections were made. There is no saying what the particular circumstances of these cases were, and so it is difficult to view them as fair and reasonable comparisons.

Yours sincerely,
Fiona MacKenzie.

Application Summary

Address: 10 Church Place Findhorn Forres Moray IV36 3YR

Proposal: Erect extension at

Case Officer: Cathy Archibald

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Fiona MacKenzie

Email: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED]

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

- Height of proposed development
- Reduction of natural light

Comments: I object to the planned extension at No 10 Church Place with regard to loss of Residential Amenity through Overshadowing. I believe my property will be adversely affected by loss, or reduction of, sunlight and natural light. Both the height, and distance to be extended from the existing building, will block sunlight and natural light from the front of my property, affecting both sitting room and one of only two bedrooms in the property. The sitting room is the main room in the property, and doubles up as a dining room, there being no separate dining room. Because the terrace is north facing, with both the sitting room and bedroom in question facing north, I have very limited hours of sunlight into these rooms. The sun only shines into these rooms in the evenings, and only in spring and summer, and even then, only at an angle so as to only reach part of the rooms. Morning sunlight only reaches the kitchen and the other of the two bedrooms, and in the middle part of the day I have no sunlight into my home at all. In winter no sunlight enters the sitting room and bedroom at the front of the property. Therefore any further reduction to sunlight entering my home would be very noticeable, and my concern is that the proposed extension to No 10 would do that.