

**PLANNING COMMITTEE DATE: 24 July 2024**

**APPLICATION NO: F/YR23/0500/F**

**SITE LOCATION: North of 43-53 High Street, Doddington**

**UPDATE**

Email received from a third party dated 16/7/24.

Following on from previous emails objecting to the application, a further email was received after the publication of the agenda.

*'I have just looked at the officer's recommendation for refusal report for F/YR23/0500/F and just want to make sure you have considered all the information we have previously provided, as your report mentions due to the removal of 2 plots and reorientation of plot 11 that one of the original reasons for refusal is removed (amenity impact on No. 8 and 9, The Larches):*

- I have highlighted a number of times the site plan is missing one of our habitual rooms, it once was a standard conservatory and now has a solid roof - for ease of reference I have drawn it on the below snip, this is a home office and habitual room (with conservatory windows around the side, but solid roof now) - which is now parallel to the dwelling 11's garage. Blocking afternoon light (see next point on lighting).*
- You reference in the report (10.44) to difference in land level: From our side of the fence is at shoulder height (even less on my 6'2" husband), so all the 'open space' proposed to be planted will literally hit us in the face as soon it's over fence height. Also, even today, the daylight in the kitchen/diner needs indoor lighting, one of the windows is lower (than I expected) due to disability rules (i.e. fence line is quite above window sill height). Our existing light isn't adequate (as no one should need interior light on today) and having plants growing by our fence/garage reducing the light coming from the home office into the kitchen diner, this can only negatively impact our already poor light, and therefore need us to use indoor lighting for the majority of the year.*
- 10.45 references the SuDs pond, I didn't realise until we read this report that's what it was, as our objection letter mentions this application site has poor drainage, and our garden has been flooded again (also happened in 2021) this year, and the flood is coming from the application site. I appreciate the site comes with modern drainage and has been approved by AW, but having lived here for 7 years and only been flooded since Juniper close was built and again this year, we really do just try to present you with the reality of what we are experiencing. Pictures attached for this years floods (excuse my child in the picture!).*

*The report mentions a number of times the re-orientation of plot 11 now has reduced the amenity impact, personally we don't feel this is true for the above reasons.*

Comment: The case officer acknowledges the comments made, however, the officers report has taken into consideration that two of the plots have been removed with one plot proposed having been reoriented to overcome direct amenity impact.

There is an existing tight relationship to the boundary from those properties namely 8 and 9 The Larches. Plot 11 proposes a detached garage with pitched roof and side gable elevations. This will not sit tight up against the boundary fencing with soft landscaping mitigating any adverse impact proposed. The orientation of the property also ensures that any direct loss of light would be later in the day/evening.

The site plan has not altered during the course of the application with clear reference to a surface water attenuation pond to the north-west of the site and a proposed pond and open space to the east of the site. Drainage issues have been addressed in the report.

A further email has been received from another third party following publication of the agenda.

*'I was furious to read of housing that you have planned for the back of my garden, 32 Juniper Close. I moved here because I was looking for peace and quiet. Selfish of me to expect, I know especially if people are looking for a home of their own to live in.*

*But you asked for our opinion and I for one want to look out and see the trees that are on the back field and hear the birds outside. Now I and others have to put up with noise, mess etc. I strongly object to the proposal as laid out in your letter.'*

Comment: Any noise/mess that is referred to is presumed to relate to any potential construction. The officer recommendation is to refuse. Should the application be overturned, it would be subject to the imposition of conditions and certain elements would be controlled through a CMP/CEMP condition.

**Recommendation:** REFUSAL – The above update does not alter the original recommendation as set out on page 70 of the agenda.