PLANNING COMMITTEE

7 May 2024

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

Item No.9/1(a) 22/01970/F Page No. 33

Third Party Correspondence: TWO letters from ONE addressee **–**

Firstly, An additional response was received from an interested party; the response was sent directly to the Conservation Officer reiterating concern over the historic significance of the bungalow (and wider group of dwellings) and asking that the Conservation Officer re-assesses the application. The Conservation Officer responded (see below),

A further response was then received from the interested party, raising similar concerns regarding heritage and design, noting the visibility of the site from Beach Road, the loss of frontage vegetation and requesting the Council serve a Section 215 Notice to require proper maintenance of the land. This response further notes that the house has been left vacant to deteriorate as no maintenance has been carried out and being at sea level, it has been left to the elements.

Conservation Officer: Provided the following response to the above correspondence -

'I am fully aware of the Country Life article submitted by the neighbour as a part of this consultation exercise, and I am fully aware of comments made by the parish council. While I appreciate and have taken on board their comments, I have already detailed at some length why I am not objecting to this application and this can be read in my email of 16th February.

As there is no new information being presented, I see no reason to re-visit the advice I have given. The case will be heard at planning committee and they will now determine the application.'

Holme Parish Council: Provided clarification as follows:

'Referring back to our telecon I have re-visited the Brownsea drawings, and I think that any reasonable person would describe the structure we discussed as a garage and not as a car port. Furthermore, although you indicated that you agree our calculations for the house - looking back at the PC's calculations I see that we did not include the verandah which would normally be counted in Table 6 (which would take the property still further over the 40%). I'm sure the PC will want to comment once they have sight of your report and we do have the benefit of input from one of our Members who is a Chartered Surveyor (and experienced RICS Arbitrator).

Notwithstanding the size, as I said when we spoke, the main concerns of the PC and indeed the local community are the negative heritage impacts of the Developer's proposals. We do feel that the Conservation Officer has not really given the existing building (indeed the group of four) the attention it deserves given the information provided in the Country Life Article and the comments of the History Group as well as those of the owners of Farm Corner, Little Holme and Seagate House. A significant amount of research into the buildings and history of this corner of Holme has been carried out recently and I believe the PC will have a very strong, evidence-based case to support its objections when the case goes before the Planning Committee.'

Assistant Director's Comments: The Conservation Team response directly to the interested party confirms that their previous consultation response still stands. The additional third-party and Parish Council comments are noted. The points raised are addressed within the report which is already with Members.

With regard to Section 215, this part of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 gives Local Planning Authorities the power to require the proper maintenance of land. As discussed within the Officer's Report, the loss of the trees and hedgerows, the main cause of concern for the Interested Party was permitted under the tree in a Conservation Area consent reference 22/00202/TREECA. It would be unreasonable to now serve a notice on the land to replace those hedgerows and trees where consent has previously been granted for their removal. Notwithstanding this, in the event that this application is approved, Conditions 3, 4, 5, 6 and 19 together ensure that the remaining trees across the site are suitably protected and retained, and that a suitably mature hedgerow is planted along the Beach Road frontage.

Item No.9/1(b) 23/01571/F Page No. 55

Third Party Correspondence: TWO additional letters of OBJECTION, summarised as follows:

- Letters of support were received from one address who does not live in Howards Close
- Proposal is not a sympathetic design, contrary to Policy 11 of the Neighbourhood Plan
- Back gardens of No. 1 and 3 are adjacent to the Conservation Area
- Proposed front window will overlook the close
- Existing two storey rear extension already increased the footprint.
- Disagree with comments regarding permitted development fallback positions & the proportions of the gable end emulating the existing gable ends within Howards Close
- The dwelling could be modified whilst preserving its frontage.
- Reiterating comments regarding the existing cohesive design of the dwellings at Howards Close
- Request the application is refused for the above reasons.

Assistant Director's Comments: The additional third-party comments are noted. The points raised as a whole are addressed within the report which is already with Members. Comments regarding the fact that the dwelling could be modified without changes to the front elevation are noted, however this application must be determined based on the proposal that is before Members.