

-----Original Message-----

From: Cllr. Roger Elkins

Sent: 07 January 2018 14:34

To: Anita Gardner

Subject: Objection to FG/115/17/PL

For the attention of Anita Gardner

Further to our conversation regarding the above I wish to add my concerns to the number of objections already raised regarding the above application.

The proposal now submitted is considerably different to the application approved under appeal, by the revised layout and size of dwelling.

I have the following concerns .

The properties are now substantial chalet bungalows comprising a number of large rooms at ground and first floor, with first floor windows that will overlook adjoining properties.

The floor area of the dwelling appears to have increased by about 70% requiring the dwellings to be relocated on the site and limiting space available for parking and turning.

Where previously there was adequate parking provision with garages and driveways giving a distance between the dwellings between the dwellings of some 4 meters there is now only a gap of about 1.8m. This reconfiguration has led to the less suitable parking configuration immediately adjacent to the rear gardens of properties to the west impacting on their privacy from both from light and noise requiring increased manoeuvring of vehicles.

The relocation of these enlarged properties also impacts on the rear gardens of properties to the south where the bulk of the proposed The revised confirmation now provides no landscaping barrier to the west and south boundary where previously there was a 3-4m landscaping strip this again impacts on the adjacent properties .

I note the concerns raised under the Highways assessment with regard to the turning head that now impacts on the first dwelling and will be contrary to policy Gen 12 From the above points I consider this proposal is contrary to Policy Gen 7 in that it does not enhance the local distinctiveness and has an unacceptable adverse impact on adjoining occupiers .

There are also still concerns regarding the delivery of the access width and the visibility splays can you clarify to me why the visibility splays are not indicated on the application dwg? and that any conditions required in the appeal are maintained.

I would also be grateful for clarity in planning terms with regard to the term bungalow referred to in the appeal and the current description where clearly there is a first floor ?

I look forward to your comments on the questions raised.

I would be grateful if the above points can be fully considered in the processing of this application and await the formal report .

Thanking you for your assistance

Roger Elkins.

Sent from my iPad