

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date: 1st December 2025

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

Item No. 9/1(a) 25/01520/F

Page No. 18

REPRESENTATIONS: FIVE additional letters received from members of the public raising issues covered within the objections already set out in the report and the following further points:

- Biodiversity Net Gain Metric has not been submitted with the application so it is not possible to assess whether the development would result in an uplift of 10%.
- Even with the protection of the Party Wall Act there is no safeguard that no problem would occur – what if it does?
- A member of the public states – The applicants' engineers report has inaccurate comments and there are no such defects according to the architect commenting on behalf of the neighbours Mr and Mrs Wells.
- Alternative proposals for refurbishment would be less harmful.
- From personal experience Party Wall Agreements are not worth the paper they are written on.
- The application should be called to committee.

Assistant Director's comments: The main report thoroughly covers the substantive nature of the comments raised above but in addition:

- As a proposal for self-build housing, the application is exempt from the BNG requirement and therefore this information was not required. Condition 8 (p. 38) is proposed to be attached to ensure the development is self-build.
- The matter of demolition and the regulations by which it is controlled is contained within the main body of the report on p. 30 and 31. The Local Planning Authority is not responsible for civil matters, but it is important to note that the applicant would be bound by this legislation during the construction and demolition of the building. The effectiveness of Party Wall Legislation is not a consideration of the Local Planning Authority.
- The submitted structural survey has not concluded that the building is unsafe and has stated that it would be possible to renovate the existing structure. However, it has stated that the building suffers from several examples of wear and tear and that considering the proposed expansion of the building, a demolition and rebuild would be preferable. The Applicant's Supporting Statement on p. 22 sets out their reasoning. Notwithstanding this, the officer has assessed the proposal based on the demolition and rebuild of a dwelling which in planning terms is considered acceptable subject to conditions.