

Application reference P20/S1588/FUL

Written statement against above application

From: Luke Thompson, owner and occupier of 251 Greys Road

I am surprised and disappointed at the planning officer's recommendation to grant approval for the proposed development and his opinion that the proposed development "would not cause material harm to the amenity of neighbours". I am also surprised by the lack of detail and specifics in relation to important elements of the planned development. In particular:

### **Overdevelopment**

- 1) The application to build 3 new dwellings (rather than 2 new dwellings as has been the case in other developments on similarly sized plots on this stretch of Greys Road) is resulting in a loss of amenity for immediate neighbours. A development of 2 new dwellings on the site could avoid this loss of amenity and avoid the need to breach the 45 degree rule in both plan and elevation in relation to 251 Greys Road. The planning officer does not reference or address the breach of the 45 degree rule in relation to elevation in his report.
- 2) The planning officer's report is inaccurate in drawing similarities in terms of development density between the recently approved development at 245 Greys Road and to the site at 267 Greys Road where "a similar form of development was also approved". The plot at 245 Greys Road, is some 14m from the neighbouring property at 243 Greys Road, creating a far more spacious development at 245 Greys Road than is being proposed at 253 Greys Road. The plot at 267 Greys Road is some 35m wide, and provided 2 dwellings, again creating a more spacious scheme, while the plot at 253 Greys Road is 30m wide and is proposing 3 new dwellings meaning virtually no separation between the proposed dwellings at 253 Greys Road and existing properties on either side at numbers 251 and 255a Greys Road.
- 3) The planning officer acknowledges in his report that the "density may be greater on this site than other plots nearby."

### **Amount of development / character**

- 1) While the planning officer's report notes that "there are clear examples where dwellings achieve the same if not shorter gaps between buildings to what is currently proposed" (although he does not go so far as to provide examples) – there are no examples along this particular stretch of Greys Road where the gaps between five consecutive neighbouring properties would be less than 2.5 metres which would adversely impact the spacious character of this stretch of Greys Road (from the Wootton Road roundabout towards Gillotts Lane).

### **Overbearing**

- 1) The planning officer makes the subjective statement that at 251 Greys Road "The neighbour would continue to benefit from an ample sized garden which would not be obstructed by the proposed development." I prefer to deal in factual and objective evidence. The proposed development would extend by more than 5 metres beyond the property at 251 Greys Road into a garden with a depth of less than 15 metres – so more than a third of the depth of the garden. The proposed development is only 1 metre from the boundary fence and a total of 2 metres (where the proposed development extends beyond 251 at the rear) from the property at 251 Greys Road. The proposed property that will extend beyond 251 Greys Road has a maximum height of 7.9 metres and minimum height of 3.53 metres (4 metres with the light turret), so exceeding the height of the existing boundary fence by a minimum of 1.5 metres and a maximum of 5.9 metres. The garden will clearly be obstructed and the

proposed property at Plot 1 clearly overbearing given its proximity to 251 and the height of the proposed development – even at “single storey”.

**Sustainable development / Conservation and improvement of biodiversity**

- 1) Although no rules may have been broken, as a direct result of the desire to squeeze 3 new properties onto a plot that could appropriately accommodate no more than 2, between 15 to 20 trees have been cut down and removed from the plot – all of these around 3 weeks prior to the various forestry and ecology reports being completed. Subsequently and in response to forestry report comments there is agreement to replant a small number of trees on the site. Nothing in that process and the attempt to avoid an accurate appraisal by all appropriate stakeholders prior to the removal of a significant number of trees says to me “sustainable development” or “conservation and improvement of biodiversity”.