

**Supplementary Report to the Planning Applications Committee
on 11 January 2017**

LW/16/0491

Page 5

As indicated in the main report, this application was deferred at the 14 December 2016 meeting, so that the applicant could consider changing the layout so that the access road was next to Milton Villa next door (and the houses were thus moved further away).

The applicant has not been able to agree to the change, commenting that the scheme is *“very symmetrical with a central access road, which we feel is very important, by moving the access road we feel it could harm the street scene elevation and throw the visual balance”*, that there has been a *“year long discussion to arrive at this optimum design”*, the Road Safety Audit confirms there are no dangers with the access, and that there are no windows to habitable rooms at first floor level facing Milton Villa (the only window is an obscure glazed bathroom window).

The left hand terrace closest to Milton Villa has, however, been moved 300mm further away from the boundary (now a gap of 4.8m to Milton Villa at the rear and 4.6m at the front).

The occupier of Milton Villa is *“very disappointed that the applicant has decided against the proposed solution which I felt fair and reasonable. The immediate terrace being moved a mere 30cm is a negligible gesture”*.

The application therefore falls to be decided as at the December 2016 meeting, except the terrace next to Milton Villa is a further 300mm away from the boundary.

In the planning officer's view the application remains recommended for approval. The gap of over 4m between Milton Villa and the terrace is considered to be acceptable, and any sunlight which would be lost to Milton Villa would be during morning hours only. The windows in the side of Milton Villa facing the site appear to be a sole kitchen window and dining room window on the ground floor (both formed when the house was extended around 2007) and first floor bathroom and bedroom windows (again, both formed when the house was extended around 2007).

While the objection raised by the occupier of Milton Villa is noted and understood, it is not considered that the alleged loss of light to Milton Villa would be sufficient grounds to justify refusal. The recommendation for conditional approval stands, as set out in the main report.