

The Planning Inspectorate

Further information on us and the planning appeal system can be found on our website www.planning-inspectorate.gov.uk

RECEIVED

16

For official use only
(date received)

THE PLANNING
INSPECTORATE
PINS 3

COMMENTS ON CASE

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable for it. This can be found in the notification letter attached. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender. Your comments can also be made on-line at www.plannningportal.gov.

This form will be published on the Planning Portal, please do NOT sign it. This is to ensure that all personal data is protected in line with the requirements of the Data Protection Act 1998.

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Case Reference:

Address of site

Postcode
(if known)

SENDER DETAILS

Name

Acting On Behalf Of
(leave blank if writing on
your own behalf)

ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?
(Neighbour, Councillor, Owner, Tennant)

What kind of representation are you making?

YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

Please provide your representation below.

As County Councillor for the Holt Ward, I write to support the refusal of planning consent for the development of land adjacent to 11 Dee Park, Holt.

On receipt of the Planning Department Case Officer's report, I noted that the recommendation to Planning Committee was originally to grant consent. However, when I considered the report in more detail and being aware of the site location, I was concerned over the proposed conditions which were felt necessary to protect the amenity of existing property occupiers and potential occupiers of the proposed dwelling.

In view of the severely sub standard amenity distances and differing land levels, it appeared that high hedges and obscure glazing were required. The plot is not particularly deep and it would have meant that within one metre of the windows on the South West elevation (overlooking The Lilacs) there was a requirement for a 1.8 metre hedge in addition to the partially obscured glazing of the windows.

Similarly, I had concerns over the North Eastern elevation (overlooking Caer Castell) because the amenity distance was some 6metres short of that recommended in Local Planning Guidance 21.

Planning Committee felt that a visit to the site would be appropriate to contextualise the development. At that time it was suggested by the Planning Manager that the hedge along the North Eastern boundary should be retained to protect the amenity of the residents of Caer Castell. Members did not accept the argument that the windows of the Caer Castell properties were already overlooked by passing pedestrians and therefore this development was acceptable. It was felt that a passing pedestrian was unlikely to pause and look into a window whereas locating a property directly opposite gave its occupants this opportunity.

In summary, in an attempt to make the development acceptable, the new property would have a high 1.8m hedge within one metre of its windows and obscure glazing to the South Western elevation as well as a high hedge within very close proximity to the North Eastern façade. This in my view would be detrimental to the living conditions of the occupiers of the new property. In addition it would give the impression of a cramped development when existing properties all have spacious garden areas or open plan frontages thus having an adverse impact on the locality / Conservation Area.

The Committee refused consent and I fully concur with the reasons for refusal as set out in the decision notice.