

**ITEM 5 – APP/22/01656: LAND ADJACENT TO OAK COTTAGE NOCTORUM ROAD, NOCTORUM, THE ERECTION OF A SEMI-DETACHED VILLA ON LAND ADJACENT TO OAK COTTAGE, WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING PROVISION AND ACCESS (2NO.DWELLINGS)**

13 further representations have been received citing the following concerns:

1. The Committee report acknowledges the density of housing on the site exceeds that permitted by Policy HS5. The report looks to argue that this is justified because NPPF and the emerging Local Plan seeks to make efficient use of land, however, whilst NPPF does encourage efficient use of development land, this requirement is qualified by design considerations with it also being stated that “The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve” (para 126). The report does not mention this fundamental qualification to the pursuit of density, instead it looks to override HS5, even though the purpose of the Policy is to specifically safeguard the character of areas that are described as having “special character” such as Noctorum Ridge. Policy HS5 remains an adopted policy of the Council and should continue to have significant weight attached to it.

2. Plot One (four bedroom dwelling) has no garaging or other undercover storage. If this proposal was approved, it is inevitable further proposals for appropriate garaging and car parking for these two dwellings would quickly follow and these would have the effect of eroding the remaining space between these proposal dwellings and the adjacent properties, conflicting with policy HS4 and HS5.

3. The access for Plot Two from Noctorum Road is directly in front of Plot One, that, in itself, is poor design brought about by seeking to construct two houses on a plot where the location of the access is severely restricted for arboricultural reasons. However, the four/five bedroom dwelling has just one parking space under a car port, but if a car was put in this, it would then have to reverse out along a 3 metre wide driveway, around a right angled bend, and then across the front of the neighbouring property to get out onto Noctorum Road (assuming that the neighbour’s vehicles had not obstructed such a manoeuvre). If the occupier had two cars, then the second car would also prevent the car port being accessed. Policy HS4 which requires new development to relate well to the existing density and form of development and to make satisfactory provision for off-street parking, garages and vehicular access.

4. The proposals include significant hardstanding within the Root Protection Areas of existing trees. It is proposed within the revised Arboricultural Impact Statement that these would be protected by using a ‘no dig’ solution such as Cellweb laid on the existing surface, which would then have hardstanding laid on top. The Statement says that the arboriculturalists are confident that this can be installed without an adverse impact on the trees, however, no justification is given for this assertion whatsoever. Furthermore, it is not clear when they say that it can be ‘installed’ without harm whether they also mean that it will not harm the trees during the development lifetime when vehicles will be repeatedly driving across significant areas of the RPA’s. The arboriculturalist goes on to say that a full detailed specification for the root protection works will be submitted for approval by the

structural engineer, this has not been submitted as part of the application, nor has a condition been suggested so far to require i

5. The proposal will have an impact on levels on the site, this makes detailed consideration of the impact of the development on the streetscene impossible to assess, as it seems likely that the slab levels of the houses will need to be raised to relate appropriately to the raised accessways.

6. The Applicant's Street Scene (19175-PJA-S-XX-DR-A-2000-B) is inaccurate and misleading, the neighbouring property Green Eaves is shown on the drawing much further away from the boundary than is in fact the case.

7. The amended drawings have reduced car parking provision, all other properties on Noctorum Road have adequate parking facilities and do not park on the road.

8. The application results in loss of character of the area contrary to the emerging Local Plan, and opens the door to other developers.

9. The proposal is contrary to HS5 housing density - it is pointless to have guidance and then break it. The argument that there is a requirement to efficiently use land could be used to build anywhere and allow for expansive overdevelopment..

10. It is important that this density guideline is not broken because it is one of the principles on which the planning application for the development of Noctorum Field was refused.

11. The scale of the trees is misrepresented on the plan and they are an essential part of the character of the area especially at the road boundary.

12. Lack of public consultation of people on road who have paid a lot of money for their houses

13. Too much floor space taken up on the property versus the size of the plot and the gardens are too small compared to the size of the plot leading to mature trees being felled unnecessarily and without any reasonable cause.

14. Potential change of use to a dwelling of multiple occupancy.

15. The scale of the property over 3 floors would have impact on the surrounding properties.