

COMMITTEE REPORT: 19/2/19 re Application 18/02078/HHFUL

RESPONSE TO STATEMENTS WHICH ARE INACCURATE/MISLEADING

STATEMENT IN REPORT	LOCATION	WHY INACCURATE/MISLEADING
"partially screened" "glimpsed"	Page 7 para 1	No 3 has no/very little screening of its rear view from footpath or village approach road, as compared to majority of houses on W side of Maffit Rd ; so the full width of house is therefore on view from both as can be seen in Document No5/3a (photographed from village approach road)
"There is approximately 11 metres between the side elevation of the proposed extension and the primary windows on no.5"	P8 para 1	Approximately 8 metres to edge of (and 9 metres to middle) of our main living room patio window
"It is accepted that the addition of the first floor element would introduce some overshadowing in a small section of the neighbours garden/patio area, but this is unlikely to reach the house itself"	P8 para 2	Not only is absolutely no evidence given for this statement but it also omits any mention of the large high pitch roof which will directly cause a large amount of overshadowing and loss of direct sunlight to the house of No5 – as demonstrated by Documents No5/1a. and No5/1c.
"the Juliet balcony... would not result in any greater impact than a window which could be installed in the rear elevation without planning permission"	P8 para 6	Juliet balcony allows for full inward opening of floor length windows and therefore occupants can stand "outside" and look to side views much more easily than with a standard size outward opening window.
"the applicant currently has a single storey element along the shared boundary with no.5. The proposed rear projection as viewed from no.5 would remain the same, albeit with the addition of a first floor element."	P8 para 2	This is a false and misleading statement. The rear projection as viewed from No 5 cannot be "the same" if there is an "addition of a first floor element" The "first floor element" (and the huge roof – which is omitted in this section of report) is why planning permission is being sought and why No5 are objecting to the plans, as the large first floor element and roof will deprive No 5 of huge loss of light and amenity – and will be totally overbearing. The "first floor element" and roof will approximately treble the square meterage of building elevation on No5 south boundary - and therefore the "proposed rear projection as viewed from No5" will be

			dramatically increased – and very different to the current situation.
“the pitched roof would face away from the neighbour, further reducing the impact”	P8 para 2		The pitched roof will face towards No5 and is approx 2.3m high by 5.7 m long adding significant visual impact and loss of light to No 5
“proposal would create one more bedroom”	P8 para 9		No 3 is currently a 4 bedroom house and will still have 4 bedrooms if these plans are built – with a reconfiguration of existing interior space to include a dressing room and a second en suite bathroom.
“The Tree Officer has not raised any objections”	P9 para 2		In fact the Tree Officers Report concludes “Tree information is required prior to the decision so that it is obvious what the impact to trees onsite and immediately offsite is” and “an understanding of the impact as stated above is required pre-determination”. So the Tree Officer states that further information regarding trees on and off site is required before any final decision regarding the trees can be made.