

Updates for DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
– 28 July 2021

Item	Updates	Page No
Item 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised visibility splays submitted via a new site plan and further highway Authority response confirming they are acceptable. 2 additional neighbour comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unfair that the applicant has submitted information past the cut-off date Why was this detail not included in the original application? Does not consider the planning history of the existing dwelling There are too many spaces in the site plan compared to the existing dwelling The provision of the visibility splays will make the site look like a car park, reduce privacy and cause overlooking. This will be out of character with the street There will be impacts on ecology The responses from the agent do not reflect the neighbour objections submitted Objections are valid concerns from residents who will be affected The fact that the house could be used as a care facility without planning consent is overplayed and is not being proposed so focus should be on the proposal The revised NPPF has been reviewed in line with this proposal and while there is some extra emphasis on trees and design, this has no material impact on the recommendation to committee. 	19-26
Item 2	The revised NPPF has been reviewed in line with this proposal however none of the changes materially impact the recommendation to committee.	27-31
Item 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised plan submitted moving the building 2.5 metres away from the northern boundary. Officer comment: Amendment is welcome as further reduces the impact on the garden space of Crossways House to the north Lobbying Statement from Applicant: The proposed dwelling sits comfortably on the site with generous garden amenity space maintained to both the North and South of the property. The plot is surrounded by large trees and hedgerows on the western and northern boundary and the intention is to allow the fruit trees on the Eastern 	28-37

	<p>boundary to continue to grow to give privacy on the site.</p> <p>The proposal has undergone several design modifications and I have worked tirelessly with the planners to alleviate the neighbour's concerns which were received during the consultation process. These revisions include reducing the extent of glazing on the front elevation, removal of first floor balcony and tree planting to the northern boundary. The most recent change being moving both the main house and cart shed a further south by approximately 2.5m, giving at least 6 metres from the boundary thus mitigating any overlooking along the Northern Boundary.</p> <p>The position of the cart shed has also been considered so that the ridge aligns with the centre of the side window to Bedroom 2 to also mitigate any overlooking concerns from the West.</p> <p>In summary we feel the dwelling proposed is in keeping in form with the surrounding properties and any overlooking concerns have been acknowledged and actioned. The proposed dwelling has also been positioned as such to ensure significant distancing from the properties along Silfield Road is maintained.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The revised NPPF has been reviewed in line with this proposal however none of the changes materially impact the recommendation to committee. 	
Item 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments received from the Highway Authority: <p>I note that the scheme for holiday accommodation units has been reduced from 7 units to 5. The revision shows an additional 4 parking spaces to be provided on the grassed area at the rear of the current parking area. As such I now consider the latest scheme to be acceptable.</p> <p>Planning condition recommended in relation to the provision and retention of the on-site car parking area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The revised NPPF has been reviewed in line with this proposal and while there is some extra emphasis on trees and design, this has no material impact on the recommendation to committee. 	38-42