

Ref. 20/00776/FUL – The Chare, Wall

We've spent some time carefully reading through the Strategic Planning Committee report and we are both shocked and disappointed by the thrust and content of the 'report'.

We can't find much/anything, in the submission that we do agree with; what follows are some of our major areas of concern.

1. The heading page drawing is out of date by 10-15 years.

2. (1.1) It is disingenuous for the planner to say "Objections have been received from the Parish Council and a number of local residents", when in fact objections have been raised by more than 30% of households in the village; more than any previous application and, significantly, with not a single submission in favour.

We know there would have been more objections but for COVID-19 and villagers growing weary of the constant applications from this Developer who, has at times, behaved badly and in an aggressive manner.

It has been acknowledged, by all previous planning officers involved with this site, due to its size and proximity to neighbouring properties, is unsuitable for development.

3. 7.28 "This scheme was for a much larger building in respect of scale and massing than the current proposal". The new proposed building, whilst not quite as tall due to the proposed excavation, is in fact longer and only slightly less tall. The Planning Inspectorate described it as "A dominant expanse of built development".

The measurements of the Holiday Lets are larger vs. the previous application for a 3-bedroom house which was dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate at Appeal.

<u>3-bedroom House (Appeal dismissed)</u>		<u>Holiday Cottages.</u>	
<u>Area</u>	124.33 sq m		127.00 sq m
<u>Length</u>	19.37		23.00 (increase)
<u>Width</u>	5.70		5.46
<u>Height</u>			<u>Approx 50 cm lower</u>

4. (2.6) "Rear elevation of Ashcroft's kitchen" -no mention of this being the main living room with large corner window overlooking the whole of the proposed site; there is existing **open** wooden boundary fencing at Ashcroft. This affords no privacy screening.

The Planning Inspectorate said in its Appeal dismissal to the last application (which was for a shorter building that was also only 50cm taller):

'The proposal would be in close proximity to neighbouring properties Ashcroft and Middle Chare, where windows overlook the appeal site. Given the large and dominant nature of the proposal and the close distance between the proposal and these neighbouring properties, it would result in overbearing effects on the neighbours' windows which would have a significant detrimental effect in terms of outlook for the occupiers of Ashcroft and Middle Chare'. We feel the current property dimensions and the proximity are too similar to the previous for the planners to ignore this ruling.

5. 7.41 “rear decking at Ashcroft (and Middle Chare) but this is not a habitable room for the purposes of assessing amenity”, possibly, but it’s highly significant in terms of amenity, privacy and outlook both sides of the boundary.

6. 8.3 “It is considered that the current proposaloccupiers of the proposed dwelling” .The whole of the proposed development site is in full unobstructed view from Ashcroft, there are no private amenity spaces for occupants of the cottages and those within the cartilage of Ashcroft and Middle Chare would be compromised too. The previous application was for a 3 bed house which would most likely be for 2-4 people. The current proposal would routinely accommodate 6. Their small amenity space and entrance door face East; this can only compound the privacy/amenity issue. We would also contend that amenity space is even more important for such small buildings.

7. The planning department have accepted **3** revisions of plans for this development, the last being on June 26th, well beyond the end of the consultation period.

Throughout the report the planner describes the development as “sustainable”; there are no local shops or services in Wall other than a Hotel. Wall Village was designated ‘unsustainable’ a number of years ago and nothing has changed.

Conclusion:

The Planning Inspectorate dismissed the previous plans for a building that was not significantly different in size or proximity to its neighbours asserting it would “have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of the new dwelling, Ashcroft and Middle Chare in respect of outlook and amenity space” and described the detrimental effects as “significant”.

Minor changes to building height, distance and use would in no way mitigate this.

Like previous proposals, the current proposal is deeply unpopular within the whole of the Wall Parish community; most significantly, the council didn’t receive any letters of approval.

There is compelling evidence against this development within the ‘Green Belt’.

Doreen & Wayne Soulsby

Nigel & Linda Scott