

**K Waterman**

**P19/S2061/FUL – strongly support refusal of application. 17 Stoke Row Road, Peppard Common**

We are the owners of 15 Stoke Row road which is adjacent to 17 Stoke Row Road and we strongly support refusal of this application.

All previous applications at this address have been refused or withdrawn as it has been deemed an unsuitable piece of land to build on due to ecological, unneighbourly, overlooking, overdeveloping, intrusion, environmental and legal considerations to name a few. This application shows a dwelling right in the middle of a piece of land within the semi rural village, which along with other gardens in adjacent properties forms a designated orchard, a significant nature corridor for wildlife and has ecological protection status. This was pointed out in the Officers report.

A dwelling of any size would be significantly detrimental to the wildlife, ecology, and environmental status which the proposed land protects.

The proposed house is right in the middle of the applicant's garden which in turn is adjacent to the middle of our garden. The closeness of the proposed dwelling would make it feel like it was in our garden due to the way our gardens are linked as a piece of land. It would overlook our amenity space by its sheer presence. It would dominate and completely intimidate us in the use of our own amenity space and detrimentally affect our pleasure and usage of the garden and it's semi-rural position. This would in turn affect the character of the row of houses and in a small village it could set undesirable precedents and ruin and alter the character of the village including its properties and history.

The chain link fence which currently separates the properties is required by law to be maintained within the rules of the covenant on it and is purely there to denote the land division between the current gardens. The low chain link fence would not provide a screen for the proposed dwelling in the middle of the plot neither would it protect each others amenities, space, privacy and the purpose of the gardens.

A 1.8m screen is proposed to hide the proposed dwelling which is in itself is a clear indication that it will overlook and be overbearing taking away privacy. The 1.8m screen contradicts the need referenced in the Officer's report to maintain the hedge and current fence in that part of the garden to 4ft. Additionally, any screening or further fencing between our property, and the proposed access road will have to be **beside** the existing fence, as we have legal ownership of the boundary fencing and all maintenance which are within our deeds, and we would not allow a change of fence height. Coupled with the covenant, the fence and screening along this boundary cannot be changed. Therefore any **additional** fence which would need to be installed within the boundary of the proposed dwelling would provide a wasteland strip which would be impossible to maintain, and create an even narrower and problematic access road for the proposed dwelling. Approval of a new narrower access road would be required to assess safety and regulation adherence for emergency vehicles and general usage.

Having two driveways immediately next to each other approaching Stoke Row Road would be very dangerous for pedestrians walking as they would have nowhere to wait safely in between driveways should vehicles enter or depart the driveways at the same time. There are no other situations locally where two driveways are so close together leading onto the road and the spaced out driveways also denote the character of the properties.

I ask you please, to also take local knowledge into account when considering this application along with the other material considerations including those outlined above. It is clear from emails from the applicants to local members of the village community of their intention to disregard any legal, environmental, ecological and other considerations for the piece of land in their garden before they move and there is no regard for the village and local community in the application.

Given the history of the refused applications, the ecology and environmental impact of the dwelling, the loss of amenity with overdevelopment of a rear garden, overlooking, intrusion into private gardens, noise and privacy concerns, setting a precedent for the semi rural village and associated loss of character, legal and ownership issues with boundaries and screening height, we strongly encourage and support a refusal of application.