

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date: 1<sup>st</sup> September 2025

### SUMMARY OF ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED SINCE THE PUBLICATION OF THE AGENDA AND ERRATA

Item No. 9/1(b) 25/01036/F

Page No. 32

**Agent:** Provided a Planning Statement, giving a description of the proposal and stating the following (summarised):

- Proposal is not overdevelopment,
- Historically, a detached garage of comparable scale to the extension was present in a similar position,
- Design retains existing eaves level and provides adequate space without need for bulky dormer additions,
- 8A won awards and forms part of the character of the area, overlay drawings show how similar the scale and form of the proposal is to this,
- Impact upon the established streetscene would not be adverse,
- The proposal will have a presence but given it would be set-back from the road, boundary treatments, surrounding buildings and established vegetation it cannot be described as dominant and is acceptable,
- Proposal is not overbearing given distances from neighbouring dwellings and retention of the low eaves height,
- Ridge height is a substantial distance from neighbouring dwellings,
- No overlooking would occur- rooflights are high-level and rear balcony is Juliet style,
- Loss of a view is not a material planning consideration,
- No undue effect on parking and turning arrangements, and
- Third party comparison to application at no.12 is unreasonable as no.12 is prominently sited and in close proximity to similarly sited and scaled neighbouring dwellings, such height restrictions would be inappropriate in this case.

**Third Party: TWO additional letters of Objection**, making comment on the Committee Report and the agent's statement summarised as follows:

- Concern over protected species given that at least two other properties of the same age along Park Hill have bat roosts and that one site was required to submit an ecological report and license as a condition of permission, Natural England requested a survey,
- Concern over the siting and form of the proposal, being bulky and detrimental to neighbour amenity through overshadowing, loss of outlook and overbearing,
- Not in keeping with local character,
- The garage that previously existed here was a small single garage,
- 8A is a new build dug into the landscape and set back out of sight on a corner plot, not changing an original bungalow and providing a new home. Also note 8a is not a subdivision of no.10,
- The extension would be closer to the road than number 10, which the agent states is prominent, should therefore be further aback than no.10,
- Boundary treatments could be removed. Existing vegetation has been left to grow high for the first time this year and could easily be returned to former heights,

Planning Committee  
1 September 2025

- Annexe of no. 10 is much closer to the proposal than the 22m given in the agent's statement,
- Parking on site will be reduced and problematic as visitors will need to park on a steep hill near a 90 degree bend on soft, unsuitable verges (due to drains running underneath),
- Question why it is appropriate to compare 8A when comparing to 12 is considered unreasonable,

**Assistant Director's comments:** The Agent's supporting statement is noted. The issues advanced by the Third Party are considered within the committee report. However, for clarity it is agreed that the proposal would extend to the north toward the highway and Park Hill itself and that the door currently faces west (downhill). The proposal would however extend toward the front and rear of the plot (as viewed from Park Hill). The garage did not exist at the time of this application, and therefore has had no bearing on the application. All properties along Park Hill are considered relevant to this case as they make up the form and character of the area. Whilst the comments regarding a height limits imposed within the locality are noted, each application is considered on its merits. The annexe of number 10 is closer to the proposal than the dwelling itself, being approx. 10-11m away. However, the proposal is not considered to have an overbearing effect on this structure. Finally, Natural England have not been consulted on this application, nor have they provided comment. The proposal is not considered to pose risks to protected species as covered in the Committee Report. The Ecology Officer confirms that they have no concerns in this case.

**Item No. 9/1(c) 25/00846/F Page No. 41**

**Assistant Director's comments:**

In reference to comments on Page 48 and 49, the relevant appeal decision is attached as **Appendix 1** respectively.

**Item No. 9/1(d) 25/00389/F Page No. 56**

**Assistant Director's comments:** Policy LP06 notes that, where relevant, development should contribute towards future proofing against the impacts of Climate Change. An example provided within this policy included adaptations for flood risk resilience which are proposed as part of this application. Whilst other elements to mitigate or reduce carbon emissions are not proposed, given the scale of this development and the fact that this application largely proposes the use of existing hardstanding, it is considered that the flood resilience measures are sufficient that this proposal would comply with the aims of Policy LP06.

In reference to comments on Paragraph 2 of Page 63, the relevant appeal decision and associated costs decision are attached as **Appendix 2** and **Appendix 3** respectively. These appeal decisions conclude that it is unreasonable to require an applicant to demonstrate compliance with the definition of a Gypsy and Traveller definition and the issue can instead be controlled through the imposition of conditions, with enforcement action being utilised to control compliance.