

PLANNING COMMITTEE

6 July 2026

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

Item No. 9/2(a) 26/00313/O

Page No. 41

Third Party: Two letters of **OBJECTION** received (summarised) regarding:

- Premature recommendation — The report recommends approval before the public meeting, creating concern that the decision is being made before public input is fully considered.
- Request for procedure — Residents ask for the exact Borough Council policy that permits issuing a recommendation before the public decision-making process is complete.
- Community cohesion claim — The report claims strengthened community cohesion and protected amenity, which residents dispute due to widespread local objection.
- Public benefit justification — Residents challenge how two self-build homes outweigh loss of agricultural land, boundary conflict, and significant objections.
- Minimal impact claim — The report states the development has minimal impact, contradicting numerous objections from directly affected neighbours.
- Contradictory shadowing statements — Pages 12–13 contain conflicting statements about shadowing and overlooking; residents request clarification and evidence.
- Drainage and flooding concerns — Anglian Water identifies unacceptable flooding/pollution risk; residents ask why existing issues are not addressed before adding more homes.
- Highway and lighting omissions — No mention of lack of street lighting, narrow roads, or pedestrian safety, despite these being major local concerns.
- Loss of privacy and amenity — Residents living behind a 3-foot fence expect severe overlooking, overshadowing, and loss of privacy; they ask how a two-storey home could avoid this.
- Fallback 2m fence concerns — A 2m fence would harm views and light; residents question how it solves overlooking or why they should bear this impact.
- Potential conflict of interest — Share changes in “The Hollies Ltd” raise concerns about future development intent and possible conflicts of interest.
- Request for policy involvement disclosure — Residents ask whether the applicant had involvement in shaping relevant planning policies.
- Lack of quantified village benefit — The report claims village benefits but does not identify or quantify them; residents argue objections show the opposite.

Assistant Director’s Comment:

The procedure for Planning Committee meetings is set out on the BCKLWN website under website [Committee details - Planning Committee](#). This explains that the agenda is published five working days before the meeting. At the point of publication, no decision has been made. Publishing the agenda and the Officer’s recommendation in advance allows Members and the public to review the recommendation before the meeting and prepare any comments or questions.

When assessing public benefit, Planning must consider economic, social, and environmental factors:

- Economic benefit — The creation of two homes contributes to the local economy through occupation of the dwellings and use of local services.

Planning Committee
6 July 2026

- Social benefit — The proposal provides two self-build/custom-build plots, helping address the Council's identified shortfall and supporting its legal duty to make such plots available.
- Environmental impact — The environmental considerations are set out in the report, including landscape, ecology, and site-specific constraints.

The comments relating to community cohesion originate from the Planning Agent/Applicant's supporting statement, not from the Officer's own assessment within the report.

As stated in the report, the Officer considers the overall impact to be minimal, but emphasises that detailed impacts will be assessed at the Reserved Matters stage. Regarding shadowing, the Officer correctly notes that some impact is expected due to the site's orientation (sun rising in the east and setting in the west). However, the extent and acceptability of this impact will be fully evaluated when detailed plans are submitted at Reserved Matters stage.

Although some neighbours currently have a 0.9m boundary fence, this could legally be replaced with a 2m fence under permitted development rights. This represents a legitimate fallback position that must be taken into account. A neighbour has questioned why they should bear the impact of a 2m fence affecting their light and outlook; however, as explained in the report, this fallback position is lawful, and the Officer did not consider it justified to remove this permitted development right when applying the six statutory tests for planning conditions.

It is also important to note that views are not a material planning consideration.

Lastly, Anglian Water's comments have been addressed in the report.