

## **Application reference P20/S1588/FUL, 253 Greys Road, Henley**

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". It would cause harm to my family home at 251 Greys Road. I highlight the following:

### **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) results 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 he states "a similar form of development was also approved". This is not correct. The plot at 245 Greys Road, is **some 14m** from the neighbouring property at 243 Greys Road, creating a far more spacious development than is being proposed here. The plot at 267 Greys Road is some 35m wide, and provided 2 dwellings, again creating a far more spacious scheme, while the subject site is 30m wide and is proposing 3 new dwellings meaning virtually **no separation** between the proposed dwellings and existing properties on either side. The separation between the proposed development and my property, for example, is only 2m, creating a tight overbearing development. The examples cited in the officer's report are either much further from their neighbours or on wider plots with fewer dwellings proposed. They do not set a precedent.
- 3) The planning officer acknowledges in his report that the "density may be greater on this site than other plots nearby" but does not justify why this is acceptable. Clearly it is not, resulting in a scheme which is cramped and overly dominant.

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

- 1) The proposed development will adversely impact on the verdant and spacious character of Greys Road. 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", he does not go so far as to provide examples. Furthermore, 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).
- 2) The 3 dwellings, due to their proximity to each other and the existing neighbours, would read as one long mass of frontage. The deep plan form means that the small gaps between each dwelling would hardly be visible, except from immediately in front of each plot – this is acknowledged at paragraph 6.7 of the officer's report. It would create what would appear to be **one large 28m wide dwelling**, completely dominating the street scene.

### **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 dwelling on Plot 1 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 2 metres where the proposed development extends beyond 251 at the rear. The projection beyond the rear of 251 Greys Road has a maximum height of 7.9 metres and minimum height of 3.53 metres, so exceeding the height of the existing boundary fence by a minimum of 1.5 metres and a maximum of 5.9 metres. The deep rear projection will be overbearing on 251 given its height, depth and proximity. It will obstruct light to habitable rooms, dominate the rear outlook and be overbearing on the most used part of the garden.

### **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”.

---

### **Greg Walters, owner 255A Greys Road**

>> Hi

>>

>> This is my written statement re the proposed development on plot 253 Greys road Henley.

>>

>> 1. Impact on character and appearance of the area.

>> 6.8 of the officers report states “ the proposed development would be of a similar density to existing built form within the area”. We do not believe this to be true: Greys road has a natural dividing line, namely the roundabout that connects Greys road to Wootton road. Eastwards from this point (including plot 245 is referenced in the officers report), there is a tremendous variety and density of housing (terraced, bungalows, apartments, single family homes). However, westwards from the Wootton roundabout there are only single family homes, all of which are on generous plots. 2 precedents only exist where a house has been demolished and new housing built (plots 255 and 267) in this long section of Greys road. In both these cases two houses, not three, were built on the site of the demolished building. Both the original 255 and 267 plots were larger than 253 where it is proposed to cram in three homes. This would be completely out of character with the area and would undoubtedly impact on the character and appearance of the area.

>>

>> 2. Impact on the amenity of neighbours

>> A) Loss of light

>> At 255A, we have only one east facing window in our main living room. The proposed development would mean we would have an approx 8 metre high brick wall approx 2.5 metres from our window, blocking virtually all of our morning light.

>> Additional the approximately 7 metre high building would extend approximately 1.5 metres beyond our rear wall blocking considerable light to our east facing bi-fold doors in our kitchen/ dining room (a single storey projection from our rear wall).

>> B) Privacy

>> We disagree with the officers conclusion in 6.20 that the rear facing windows on the proposed development on plot 3 would not allow clear or easy views of the neighbours patio area: not only would it provide line of sight to our patio area, it would also provide line of sight through our east facing bi fold doors into our kitchen / dining room. Equally the proposed two rear facing second floor windows would allow line of sight through the glass roof of our kitchen/ dining room as well as the patio area.

>>

>> In conclusion, we believe the proposed development will have a negative impact on the character and appearance of the area, and will have a detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbours by obstructing daylight and intruding on privacy. We urge you not to grant planning permission. We would have no objection to a development of two homes that addressed the privacy / light issues raised.

>>

>> Thankyou

>> Greg Walters, owner 255A Greys road