

Appendix A

Mr Turner advised that, having engaged in early pre-application discussions, the proposal had received a positive response from Officers. Assessing the proposal in more detail, it had been decided to balance the street view by reflecting the development recently approved at 19 Bear Close.

The current application proposed a hipped roof and equivalent footprint to number 19 in order to create a harmonised street view.

Mr Turner acknowledged the concerns expressed by local residents with regard to parking provision but remained satisfied that two parking spaces could be provided for each property.

Mr Turner considered the scheme to be straightforward and felt the new dwelling to be correctly placed to reflect the on-street view. The proposal incorporated a high standard of design and Mr Turner invited Members to approve the application in accordance with the Officer recommendation.

Appendix B

Good Afternoon

I live at 13 Balliol Close, adjacent to the application site. I am objecting on the grounds that:

The proposal is contrary to both local and national planning policy,

Material planning considerations render the proposal unsound and

The proposal is inaccurate and in parts vague or incomplete.

The proposal is contrary to Local Plan Policy CO1 which prescribes that development should be 'of an appropriate scale and type' and to Policy OS2 which prescribes that development must be 'of a proportionate and appropriate scale to its context', 'form a logical complement to the existing scale and pattern of development' and 'protect or enhance the local landscape'. The NPPF similarly references 'maintaining an area's ... character and setting, including residential gardens'

This proposal is contrary to these policies. It is for a building double the size of neighbouring dwellings on Balliol Close. The building's large size and proposed higher floor level would not enhance the landscape but render the building overbearing, intrusive and conspicuous from a distance against the skyline.

Policies OS2 and OS4 emphasise that a development should 'not have a harmful impact on the amenity of existing occupants' and should not 'harm the use or enjoyment of land and buildings nearby'. Yet this development would impact on my amenity in terms of loss of privacy, overlooking and blocking of sunlight to my garden. The parking adjacent to my boundary would result in overlooking and noise from vehicles manoeuvring and the slamming of car doors. This would compound the detriment I already suffer from the Balliol Farm estate.

The Officer dismisses my concerns regarding overlooking on the grounds that 'the proposed dwelling would be located some 14 metres to the east of the rear garden', disregarding the fact that parking adjacent to my boundary would be a major source of overlooking. He also asserts that there is an existing 1.8 metre fence with mature planting along the fence line. This is inaccurate. The fence is 1.2 metres – low enough to enable overlooking into my garden. The planting comprises deciduous trees with canopies above the height required to prevent overlooking from ground level and ineffective in preventing overlooking from upper windows during winter months.

In view of the failure of the proposal to comply with planning policies, the harm to my amenity, the points in the proposal that are inaccurate or vague and the concerns of the Parish Council and other neighbours, regarding Fixed Floor levels and access I ask the Committee to reject the application.