

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 30 April 2025 16:04  
**To:** Section 62A Applications Non Major <section62anonmajor@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** 43A Ambleside Avenue 25/11073/PINS

Application Ref No. 25/11073/PINS

As a close neighbour I strongly object to the proposed development.

In 2022 an application for a 2-bed house development on this small site was thankfully refused. I believe that the concerns that myself and many neighbours raised at that time, continue to be pertinent to this current proposal for an even larger 3-bed development.

The officer report for the failed 2-bed proposal should make it clearly obvious as to why this larger proposal should also be refused. The officer report stated that:

"The LPA is of the view that the proposed development would fail to respect the character and appearance of the area and would result in a large and cramped development."

Looking at the current proposed plans, very little has changed, other than to make the development larger! Design and layout is virtually identical aside from the additional bedroom space.

Crucially, as the current proposed development is markedly larger than the 2022 refused proposal, the officer report also stated that:

"The LPA raised concerns with the scale of the development and recommended the front and dormer elements be removed, hard-standing reduced and overall dwelling size reduced in scale and width."

So it is with slight disbelief, that I find myself needing to object to an application for an even larger development.

Another application for a 1-bed home was submitted after the 2-bed plans were refused. This was granted with conditions.

Even in this Design statement for this current proposal, the architect notes that this smaller 1-bed development was not acceptable, as in their own words "the resulting provision of a small bedroom, and no real bathroom is for an unsatisfactory layout". It is clear to everyone that the site is far too small for even a 1-bed housing development, nevermind this larger proposal for a 3-bed development, on this same small, cramped site.

The existing dwelling has a 67 Msq. floorspace.

The previously refused application had a 80.6 Msq floorspace.

This application proposes a floorspace of 93.2 Msq.

To summarize, I have concerns regarding:

- \* The hugely overbearing size of the proposed development in such a small site.
- \*The creation of a soakaway drainage area close to my boundary wall, which is an already water-logged area after rain. I'm concerned this will damage my boundary wall area.
- \*Lack of privacy and outlook at the rear of my property due to the 3-storey nature of the proposal.
- \*Loss of 13 Msq of grassed area and plants within the the proposed site.
- \*Loss of grass verge areas to the front of the site to create a parking area.
- \*Insufficient gap between the proposed development and No41, and impact on No41's ability to use and enjoy their property (noted as one point of refusal by the planning officer for the previously refused application).

As neighbours, we were relieved that the concerns we all raised in 2022 were both acknowledged and shared by the Planning Officer, and that it was noted that allowing poor quality, cramped developments, is not the way to solve the housing crisis.

We are hopeful that this view will, once again, prevail.

(Please note Application Ref 22/00347/F in relation to previous causes for refusal).

Many thanks,

A. Hughes

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]