

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date: 11th May 2026

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

Item No. 9/1(a) 26/00414/F Page No.15

Agent: Submitted a supporting statement, summarised as follows:

- Describes the proposal,
- The garage has been positioned slightly further forward in the plot and further away from the southern boundary, increasing separation,
- The eaves and ridge are 375mm higher than approved, resulting from a 300mm lift to finished floor level plus one additional brick course at eaves level (75mm). The roof pitch remains at 40 degrees,
- The side personnel door and rear ground-floor window have been added since the original approval; these are on the ground floor and below the height of the boundary treatment and therefore do not create overlooking, The previously suggested first-floor gable window (in the withdrawn submission) has been removed and replaced with a rooflight in the side elevation facing the applicant's dwelling to avoid overlooking concerns.
- The garage and room above are for domestic/ancillary use only, with no business use proposed. The withdrawn application was primarily withdrawn due to an error within the submission which led to a misunderstanding regarding the temporary use.
- This resubmission focuses the assessment of the proposal on the modest height variation (375mm) and minor siting adjustments, alongside a revised window arrangement designed to remove any perceived overlooking impacts. Overall, the proposal remains a domestic outbuilding appropriate to the host dwelling and its context.

Photographs were also submitted alongside this statement, which are viewable on the public access system.

Assistant Director's Comment: The supporting statement is noted.

It is also noted that no existing plan has been submitted and there is a window in the northern gable at first-floor level. Given the proposal would alter the existing building, particularly through the blocking of the upper window, it is necessary to attach a condition requiring the remaining construction of the building to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans prior to its first use.

Additional Condition

3 Condition. Prior to the first use of the garage and store room hereby permitted, the upper gable window to the front (northern) elevation shall be blocked up permanently and retained in accordance with the approved plans thereafter.

3 Reason. For the avoidance of doubt.

Item No. 9/1 (c) 25/01749/O Page No.48

Third Party: One item of correspondence submitted in support of this application and 25/01775/O raising the following summarised grounds:

- Neither development would have any adverse impact on neighbouring properties in terms of overlooking, shadowing, or any other forms of impact that are typically considered relevant to such proposals.
- The land is currently in a very poor condition and it is cut only once every few years.
- This land may be classed as agricultural land but is unused, unmaintained scrub land that provides no productive or environmental benefit.
- The trees lining the road frontage are not properly cared for, weather-damaged and in poor condition.
- No objections were received from bodies such as the Highways Department or other relevant authorities.
- Other housing schemes have been approved in locations further outside the village development envelope.
- Better cost implications for self-build development.
- Recent developments, including the construction of Tilney Manor and three additional dwellings completed in 2022 further along the road towards the church, were also located outside the defined development boundary. If those schemes were permitted, does not understand why the current proposal is now considered problematic?
- Objections to the proposal to construct a path from the site to the tunnel adjacent to Tilney Manor. The specification proposed—specifically a width of four feet—is unnecessarily large and imposing. A path of two feet would be entirely appropriate for this location.
- It is also the case that residents along Church Road do not currently make use of the existing path, which is overgrown with vegetation and has not been maintained.
- Scope for further housing within the local school's capacity, and employment levels among working residents in the village are low. Local businesses would also benefit from increased access to a larger, more diverse workforce and community support.
- Strongly support this development. It is a project that has been long overdue, and believes it would bring clear advantages to the local area.

Assistant Director's Comment: Members will be aware that a 'premium on neglect' is not applied to the consideration of planning applications.

Tilney Manor was a replacement dwelling, so different policies apply. The plots referenced nearer the Church, whilst not specifically identified, are believed to have been approved when the Council could not demonstrate a 5-year supply of housing land and comprised the infilling of a small gap between existing dwellings.

The footpath proposed is to NCC standards.

Item No. 9/1 (d) 25/01775/O Page No.68

Third Party: One item of correspondence submitted in support of this application and 25/01749/O raising the following summarised grounds:

- Neither development would have any adverse impact on neighbouring properties in terms of overlooking, shadowing, or any other forms of impact that are typically considered relevant to such proposals.
- The land is currently in a very poor condition and it is cut only once every few years.
- This land may be classed as agricultural land but is unused, unmaintained scrub land that provides no productive or environmental benefit.
- The trees lining the road frontage are not properly cared for, weather-damaged and in poor condition.
- No objections were received from bodies such as the Highways Department or other relevant authorities.
- Other housing schemes have been approved in locations further outside the village development envelope.

- Better cost implications for self-build development.
- Recent developments, including the construction of Tilney Manor and three additional dwellings completed in 2022 further along the road towards the church, were also located outside the defined development boundary. If those schemes were permitted, does not understand why the current proposal is now considered problematic?
- Objections to the proposal to construct a path from the site to the tunnel adjacent to Tilney Manor. The specification proposed—specifically a width of four feet—is unnecessarily large and imposing. A path of two feet would be entirely appropriate for this location.
- It is also the case that residents along Church Road do not currently make use of the existing path, which is overgrown with vegetation and has not been maintained.
- Scope for further housing within the local school’s capacity, and employment levels among working residents in the village are low. Local businesses would also benefit from increased access to a larger, more diverse workforce and community support.
- Strongly support this development. It is a project that has been long overdue, and believes it would bring clear advantages to the local area.

Assistant Director’s Comment: Members will be aware that a ‘premium on neglect’ is not applied to the consideration of planning applications.

Tilney Manor was a replacement dwelling, so different policies apply. The plots referenced nearer the Church, whilst not specifically identified, are believed to have been approved when the Council could not demonstrate a 5-year supply of housing land and comprised the infilling of a small gap between existing dwellings.

The footpath proposed is to NCC standards.

Item No. 9/1(e) 26/00275/F Page No.91

Assistant Director’s Comment: Reference to Policy LP21 within the reason for refusal on p. 103 should be removed as it has been included in error. The amended reason for refusal is as follows:

Amended Reason

1. The proposal would conflict with the spatial and sustainability aims of the Development Plan through its siting, some distance from the nearest development boundaries, resulting in increased car journeys into a rural area.

The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies LP06, LP07, LP13 and LP18 of the Local Plan and Paragraph 89 of the NPPF.