

From: Alexandra Daymond [REDACTED]
Sent: 12 January 2014 21:46
To: Anita Gardner
Subject: Application No. A/138/13

Dear Mrs Gardner

Further to our telephone conversation on Friday, I would like to confirm our objections/issues with the above outline planning application as follows:

1) Paragraph 6 of the application states that the proposals do not require the creation of any rights of way. As discussed, Old Mill Lane is not a public highway. We own the majority of Old Mill Lane and rights of way would therefore be required in order to access the site and build the new dwelling. This has not been discussed with us.

2) Paragraph 9 states that boundary treatments will be "as existing". This is incorrect as the application states elsewhere that part of the flint wall between the application site and Old Mill Lane would be knocked down to access the site. As stated above, we own the majority of Old Mill Lane (being all of the lane except for a small section at the northern end) and the section of wall between the site and Old Mill Lane is a party wall. This has also not been discussed with us. The vehicle access row should also indicate that access is intended to be via Old Mill Lane, including knocking down a section of the flint wall that we part own.

3) Paragraph 11 states that the foul sewage would be disposed of via mains sewer (although it then states that it is unknown whether connection will be made to the existing drainage system). The mains sewer only runs along the High Street and we would be very surprised if connection could be made to this without having to dig up a large section of Old Mill Lane which we own - this would apply in relation to most/all utilities.

4) Paragraph 12 indicates that surface water will be disposed of via a sustainable drainage system. We are not sure how this would be achieved on a relatively small site.

5) Paragraph 24 (under the certificate of ownership) certifies that the requisite notice has been given to everyone who, 21 days before the date of the application, was the owner of any part of the land to which the application relates. We have not received such a notice and this is therefore incorrect.

6) There are also a number of issues with the Planning and Design & Access Statement as follows:

- There is no mention that Old Mill Lane is owned by a third party;
- It is also stated that access from Old Mill Lane would require the removal of a short length of flint wall - this is the wall between the application site and the lane which we own. Since this would be an access for vehicles, presumably a section of approximately 3.6 metres would need to be removed (which does not look to have been recently repaired in any significant way);
- It is stated that the development would not impact upon the character or appearance of the surrounding area or the amenities of nearby residents. A new dwelling would impact upon the character and appearance of Old Mill Lane by making the entire lane enclosed rather than having an open section, and also by removing a significant section of the old flint wall which is right next to/in the conservation area;
- It is stated that there are other similar dwellings along Old Mill Lane that have been permitted in recent years - there is in fact only one such dwelling; and
- The two passing bays mentioned in Old Mill Lane are not really sufficient to allow two vehicles to pass in this very narrow old lane.

We understand from our aforementioned conversation that you will contact the applicant's agent to discuss the above concerns and look forward to hearing from you.

In the meantime we would be grateful if you could acknowledge receipt of this email.

Kind regards
Mr & Mrs Daymond