results in less than 12 metres separating these dwellings from the south wall of the proposed development and in general terms I am concerned that the full two storey development proposed would appear very close and unduly obtrusive in relation to those dwellings. Furthermore, not only are the separation distances minimal but there are main living rooms at first floor level facing directly onto the rear of those properties. I accept that the careful positioning of the windows, combined with a use of high level clear and obscure glazing would reduce the full extent of any potential overlooking, however, situated so close to the boundary the perception of being severely overlooked, particularly from units 1 and 2 would be very intrusive and harmful to the amenities of those residents.

5. With regard to the Palatine Road houses backing onto the west boundary of the site adjacent to the access, this proposed development is significantly closer to the boundary than the proposed studio/workshop for which planning permission was granted in 1994. Furthermore, that development was not as wide a building and was sited much closer to the southern boundary and further away from these particular properties. These dwellings have particularly small rear garden areas and by comparison with the earlier proposal, it is my opinion that the proximity and bulk of this current development would be substantially more overbearing to those residents.

6. To the north of the appeal site the Brighton Road dwellings are set back approximately 14 metres from the site boundary and with a distance of approximately 16 metres separating the buildings. Whilst this would be an improvement on the south elevation, it is my view that the new development would still be very obtrusive so close to the boundary. A situation that is again exacerbated by the layout of the first floor accommodation, particularly in units 2 and 3 and the potential invasion of privacy that imposes on the residents of Brighton Road.

7. Turning to the eastern boundary of the appeal site, the Council has raised concern regarding the close proximity of the proposed development to Lyn Mews. This is a relatively recent semi-bungalow form of development with small dormer windows fitted with obscure glazing overlooking the site. At ground floor level however, there are windows serving the living area which are within 2.5 metres of the existing high brick wall forming the site boundary. This wall is in excess of 3 metres in height and undoubtedly severely restricts the amount of sunlight or daylight reaching the rear of those existing dwellings. However, the flank wall of unit 3 would extend a further 3 metres above the top of the existing wall and within 1.5 metres of the boundary. As a result standing close to the window inside the Lyn Mews dwellings, the upper part of the wall would be visible. Whilst the existing view of the sky is clearly very limited at present, it would be even further restricted by this proposal which would further exacerbate the oppressive and overbearing environment.

8. I have considered carefully each of these peripheral site conditions, including the potential loss of light. Whilst I do not consider the proposed development would be detrimental in terms of sunlight and daylight, it is my view that the proposal would not be acceptable in terms of the other amenities referred to in the Council's reasons for refusal. In my opinion, they are all symptomatic of a general problem arising from the narrowness of the site, the height of the development and the cramped layout of the proposed dwellings. In exemplifying policy HO11, the UDP recognises the particular difficulties relating to sites of this nature, however, it also emphasises the need to avoid undue loss of amenity. I have therefore concluded that the proposed development would be detrimental to the amenities of nearby residents by reason of overlooking, loss of privacy and the obtrusive form of the development. Therefore, in my opinion, the proposal is in conflict with the policies of the UDP.