From: John Crump

Sent: 09 February 2025 17:52

To: Section 62A Applications Non Major <section62anonmajor@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

Subject: Objection to planning application 24/04484/PINS

Dear Sir / Madam,

I strongly object to the planning application 24/04484/PINS on the following grounds:

- 1) Overdevelopment of the site
- 2) Incongruous design
- 3) Loss of privacy
- 4) Loss of light
- 5) Nuisance
- 1) Overdevelopment of the site. The 2024 application for planning approval for a build on this site was rejected on the grounds that it would represent a cramped, intensive and incongruous form out of keeping with the surrounding properties. This is still true of this proposed development. Furthermore, the deeds to my house identify that there is a pre-existing restrictive covenant limiting development to no more than 3 houses per acre along Druid Stoke Avenue.

The proposed site will be cramped and unattractive and not in keeping with the general nature of the area, which as can be seen from the OS map, is large houses on large plots with gardens of similar or greater footprint in relation to the houses.

There will be hardly any garden for the new house, as a significant proportion of the plot will be given over to buildings and hard surfacing. Not only will the development be visually unattractive, but the amount of hard surfacing will also have an impact on the local wildlife, particularly on the many species of birds that live in the trees on and in gardens adjacent to the plot.

There are a number of photographs in the Planning Statement for the new house which are out of date and give the misleading impression that there is a large area of No 8's garden lying to the North West of the proposed plot (Pages 2, 6, 7, 13, 15, 16). This area of garden does not belong to No. 8, it has belonged to since 2022. See Title Deeds plan below.

[Industrial content of the new house which are out of date and give the misleading impression that there is a large area of No 8's garden lying to the North West of the proposed plot (Pages 2, 6, 7, 13, 15, 16). This area of garden does not belong to No. 8, it has belonged to landscaped this land into a wildlife friendly garden.

Additionally, I would like to point out that the future owners of the existing No 8 will be subject to significant overlooking.



- 2) Incongruous design. From the drawings of the Elevations of the new house, it appears that there is little standalone design merit in the building that would contribute positively to the character of this part of Druid Stoke Avenue. There is no new artist's impression of the proposed house, and there is little information to evaluate whether the design, materials used etc. will be sympathetic or not but we do know that the previous design from the same architect comprehensively failed to respect the character of the street.
- 3) Loss of privacy. The new house is to be built unacceptably close to the boundary between 8 Druid Stoke Avenue and and will create overlooking of both house and garden. The Planning Statement addresses overlooking of neighbours from the South-East elevation, the South-West elevation and the North-East elevation, but there is no acknowledgement of the overlooking, or 45-degree angle calculation, relating to the North-West elevation; ground floor French windows or upper window. It is the NW ground floor French windows and NW upper bedroom window which are the main cause of our concern about loss of privacy and overlooking. If the 45-degree angle plan started from any of these windows, the loss of privacy issue would be immediately apparent. The Planning Statement claims that there is existing dense hedging fronting the boundary with No 6. This is untrue; the dense hedging is only present in the first 15 metres of the eastern end of the boundary. For the 23.5 metres of boundary at the western end, where the proposed house is to be sited, there is no hedge at all, only shrubs and a lightweight fence. On the NW elevation of the new house the plans show for the ground floor living room, 2 ceiling height (c3m) French windows/ doors on the NW side which will directly face into our garden and which diagonally face onto the French windows of our living room at a distance of around 15 metres. The plans also show that the NW French windows/ doors will directly face onto the patio in the garden outside our house, where we sit with our friends and family as an alternative to our living room in good weather. On the first floor, the small NW bedroom window of the new house will overlook our garden, living

room and upstairs bedroom. NW windows/ doors in the new house are not needed **at all**; in every room with windows in the NW elevation, there are windows on the walls of the other elevations. We ask that if planning permission is to be granted that there should be a condition that all windows on the NW side should be **removed** from the plans or filled with opaque glass.

- 4) Loss of light. It is hard to establish the overall size of the new house from the plans, but it is around 9 metres tall by 11 metres wide, so occupying around 47% of the unhedged Western end of the boundary. The sheer mass of the building and its proximity will have an overbearing impact on our property and block light to the house and the garden from the East in the mornings and the South during the day.
- 5) Nuisance. As in the previous application, the plans on the Planning site are silent on the water and drainage management aspects of the development, other than a reference in the Application document that the new house will not be connected to the public sewerage nor to a septic tank. There is no plan showing the current connections to mains clean water, to public sewerage, or showing the location of any alternative to a septic tank. The site is slightly downhill of the road and we are fearful of nuisance from any installation for the treatment or pumping of waste water. It is hard to see how it would be possible to site a septic tank at the required 7m from the house, given the size of the plot. Similarly, there is no information about the location of the air source heat pumps, which may create noise nuisance.

In the event that there is a hearing, I would wish to attend and speak.

Kind regards,

Dr. John Crump