

PLANNING COMMITTEE

1st June 2026

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

<p>Item No. 9/1 (a) 25/01783/FM Page No. 16</p> <p>Agent: Confirmed in an email dated 22 May 2026 that all pre-commencement conditions are agreed.</p> <p>Correction to Planning Condition 2 – approved plans:</p> <p>Site and Location Plans 9825-FM-XX-XX-D-A-100.P-1.06</p> <p>Assistant Director’s Comment: Agreement to pre-commencement conditions noted.</p>
<p>Item No. 9/2 (a) 25/01420/F Page No. 46</p> <p>Cllr Parish: Provided an email noting three separate points, summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The Report to committee misses details of the CSNN teams comments, referring to 16th April response in particular where the CSNN officer states whilst the Noise Impact Assessment (NIA) results in no grounds to object, they remain concerned over the length of time the padel courts will be in use and recommend the hours are reduced.- Noting that around two thirds of the supporting comments are not from local residents- Provided a link to an article regarding padel courts and noise and light nuisance which are known to be a matter. <p>Assistant Director’s Comment:</p> <p>The comments from Cllr Parish are noted. In particular, the hours of operation were confirmed as acceptable by the CSNN team on the 15th May and these most recent comments are available to view on the online file (as noted within the report). It should be recognised that the NIA included a survey of an existing padel facility and used this as the basis for all consideration, with conclusions based on the worst case scenario. Even without the additional measures controlled by the Operational Management Plan (OMP) (condition 4), the proposal would not result in adverse impacts on neighbouring residents in regard to noise.</p> <p>Lighting is also considered to be acceptable, with the lighting proposals being agreed by the CSNN team at an early stage of the application and further controlled via the OMP under Condition 4.</p> <p>An informative is recommended to ensure the Applicant is aware of the implications of the Environmental Protection Act in regard to disturbance.</p>

Agent: In relation to the boundary fence with 9 Julian Road, the Agent states “Our survey and drawings refer to the fence that is closest to the applicant’s property, which, from the description provided ... suggests the original fence.”

Third Party: Six further representations from neighbouring owners / occupiers have been received. The comments made are summarised as follows:

- The North Wootton Neighbourhood Plan has been ignored by the North Wootton Parish Council and the Planning Officer
- The loss of a 2-bed affordable bungalow is significant as there are not enough at present
- This 40 year old strategically laid out development has remained spacious, unspoilt and tranquil. This will be lost as a result of the development.
- Architect misrepresented the proposal. Firstly showing as a 3-bed semi and now on revised plans there is now a bedroom 3 and bedroom 4.
- Planning Officer bases the recommended approval largely on “street scene”. There is no street scene to this property so is not a relevant reason to approve it.
- The original officer concerns have not been addressed in terms of impact on amenity of residents. Concerns have been ignored.
- Planning Officer request to bring the extension off the boundary have been ignored.
- The Committee Report grossly exaggerates the closeness of the existing garage.
- The comments about permitted development rights are inaccurate and misleading.
- The single storey flat roof provides “approximate dimensions” only.
- There are two fences erected on the boundary with 9 Julian Road. The official boundary fence and a second higher fence that was erected by the previous owners. Written confirmation is required on which fence was used to measure the 1m gap to the extension.
- There is a high impact on form and character of this neighbourhood and density is unjustifiably and uniquely changed and, therefore, does not enhance the quality of the environment.
- Proposal does not include any overshadowing drawings or proper information to assess amenity impacts. SunCalc cannot be relied upon.
- The evening setting sun is blocked by the new development.
- Proposal has caused stress, loss of sleep and depression.

Assistant Director's comments: The additional representations are noted and the substantive points have been addressed within the committee report. Specific reference is made to maintaining a supply of 2 bedroom homes within North Wootton and devaluation property within the main body of the report and additional correspondence. Whilst the Neighbourhood Plan refers to Housing Mix (Policy 1) which seeks to provide a supply of homes that reflect local housing need, it relates solely to new build development and not those wishing to extend their homes, for which extensive permitted development rights exist (fall-back position). Whilst the property is increasing in size, it sits within a substantial plot and officers consider that the development would not be detrimental to form and character of the locality. Devaluation of property is not a material planning consideration. The effect of proposed development on third parties is acknowledged however neighbour amenity issues have been thoroughly assessed within the report on p. 86-88.