

I write in response to your letter dated 15 April regarding amendment to the above planning application. I note that previous objections will still be taken into consideration in the decision-making process and would reaffirm my comments.

1 Following this amendment, on revisiting the application I would like to expand on a point raised in my previous comment, specifically relating to the trees involved in the proposal. I have stated that I consider the representation of trees as shown on the Existing and Proposed Block Plans on the Council's Planning website and labelled as 'Existing Screening' to be misleading in that it only provides part of the story. The Design and Access Statement states that 'The property benefits from mature tree lined screening to the North East and South East boundaries'. However, the trees on the Northern boundary are on public land, and those on the Eastern boundary, in the garden of a property on the lower level of the Estate. There are none shown within the curtilage of the plot. I believe that, as one of the validation requirements, the Block Plan is supposed to show the position of all trees (existing and proposed) on the site and those on adjacent land that could influence or be affected by the development. In addition, a Tree Survey & Report is required for applications that propose development affecting trees, including on site or on adjoining/neighbouring land, or works to trees.

As part of the Core Plan, I understand that the Council promotes the importance of preventing adverse impacts on birds and habitats and considers that new development should protect and, where opportunities arise, enhance biodiversity. There are in fact a great many trees on the site. These have never been managed and have consequently grown to a substantial height, becoming home to a variety of birds which have regularly nested there over the years. I do not believe that removal of the trees would be consistent with the Council's stated objectives.

I questioned in my earlier comment whether the site could accommodate a development of the proposed scale were the trees to remain in situ. Moving the development further back, as necessitated by the amended application, will further reduce the size of the gardens. The generous width of the plot means that the bungalow currently has adequate usable space, notwithstanding the presence of the trees. I cannot comprehend that cramming two properties on to the site would create acceptable amenity for future occupants, particularly given that the garden of Plot 7b falls away in the eastern corner. If the trees are to remain, would the applicant be obliged to put in place plans for their long-term maintenance, despite not having maintained them thus far?

A Tree Survey and Report would, of course, provide reliable detail and accuracy and I would hope that the Applicant has complied with this requirement. I am a terrible photographer, but hope the attached photos of each boundary of the plot will help to give you a clearer picture regarding the height and profusion of the trees. The photographs taken from the public land on the northern boundary include those depicted on the Block Plan. However, there are others within the curtilage which, although partly visible, are not clearly shown. The same is true of those taken from the eastern boundary on the lower level of the estate. I have already raised my concerns surrounding the effect the removal of the trees would have on land which is already known to be unstable, and my personal fears regarding the consequences for my home and garden, and for those of neighbours on the lower level of the estate.

2 I would also like to raise the issue of noise and vibration. The Council's Policy states:

*'It is important that new development does not create unacceptable impacts on health and quality of life as a result of noise or vibration during both construction and operational phases and cumulatively with other development'.*

Given the history of the land, I am assuming that piled foundations would be required for any new development. This work, together with the scale of demolition involved, would certainly have adverse effects on our well-established and hitherto peaceful neighbourhood. In addition, the machinery required on site to carry out the works would present additional problems in this small, residential area with only one narrow access road.

3 I have not previously considered the potential loss of light [REDACTED] which would be facing the side wall of the proposed two-storey property on Plot 7b.

I appreciate that there are issues connected with this application which, under normal circumstances, may not be classed as material considerations. Nonetheless, I note that each application is considered on its merits and sincerely hope that our concerns will be considered with this in mind.

