

Comments for Planning Application 21/504571/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/504571/FULL

Address: Greystone Bannister Hill Borden ME9 8HU

Proposal: Demolition of existing property and erection of 2no. five bedroom dwellings with associated parking and private amenity space as amended by drawing no's. 21.29_PL_11 Rev A; 21.29_PL_12 Rev B; 21.29_PL13 Rev B; 21.29_PL14 Rev A and 21.29_PL_20.

Case Officer: Claire Attaway

Customer Details

Name: Mr Clive Jenkins

Address: Highbanks House, Hearts Delight, Borden Sittingbourne, Kent ME9 8HX

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: We strongly object to 21/504571/FULL on the grounds that it is an unnecessary overdevelopment of the site, it would massively damage the amenity of neighbouring properties including the significant overshadowing and loss of light to Wykeham, it would increase the risk of a traffic accident on Bannister Hill and that it will create a significant precedent for the density of future development applications in the village.

Overdevelopment - During the site visit when the applicant was asked why they were trying to build such a vast property so close to Wykeham rather than a smaller property that was more suited to the size of the plot that would seek to mitigate the objections raised by local residents they simply answered, "because it fits on the plan". Clearly, that doesn't mean it's appropriate for the site or the village and shows the applicant is maximising the site and overdeveloping it. It also highlights the complete lack of consideration of existing residents' views and objections that has gone into this plan regarding the local area, neighbouring properties and residents. This blatant disregard of the genuine concerns and views of residents should be of a deep concern to Swale Borough Council and Borden Parish Council over the significant precedent this application if approved will be setting. This overdevelopment of the site will only amplify the traffic issues on Bannister Hill and Hearts Delight.

Overshadowing - It is indisputable that the proposed property would cause overshadowing to Wykeham. The proposal would block the afternoon and evening sun from reaching Wykeham's rear living space. The site visit couldn't have made this any clearer and the markings showing the proposed scale and positioning of the property only served to further amplify this. I cannot believe the overshadowing impact the proposed house on Plot 4 will have on Wykeham complies with routinely applied Council standards.

"Buildings should be designed to avoid overshadowing and minimise shading from obstructions to

sunlight" The Kent Design Guide

Loss of light - The loss of light to Wykeham's lounge is clearly illustrated by the applicant's diagrams and our surveyors who specialise in loss of light have already advised us, a breach is a breach, it doesn't matter if it touches the house or a sloped part of the roof, it is still blocking light. In combination with the overshadowing, it is in direct conflict with the local plan policy DM14 which advises that developments should respect the amenities of occupiers of neighbouring properties by ensuring that developments do not create loss of sunlight, overshadowing, overlooking, result in excessive noise, activity or vehicular movements or visual intrusion. It is our understanding that this policy is part of the Local Plan to protect neighbouring properties from being damaged by developments like the one proposed where so little consideration and care has been given to any surrounding property.

Inaccuracies and Proximity - Despite the acceptance of the inaccuracies in the previously submitted plans it is important to highlight a further inaccuracy with the latest plans. The rear garden of Wykeham is incorrectly shown as flat when there is actually an incline from the rear of the property to the boundary of approximately 200mm. The difference in levels was acknowledged by the councillors when standing in the rear garden of Wykeham as part of the site visit. This means the total elevation from the proposed property to Wykeham the house is approximately 1m. This was why we were concerned and questioned when 650mm was quoted incorrectly at the recent site meeting as this does not correlate with the plans or with actual reality in respect of the property of Wykeham.

The current Greystone property which [at its nearest point, due to it being angled] is actually 14m away from the boundary as shown in 21.29_PL11. The proposed development, in comparison, is 11.72m closer with only 0.5m decrease in elevation. Again this highlights the property is too close to the boundary with Wykeham and as a result adversely affects neighbouring properties.

The rear wall of Greystone is 33m away from the rear wall of Bellami. The rear wall of Plot 4 will be no more than 20m from the rear wall of Bellami. This is a significant worsening of the overlooking issue. The realistic angle of vision from the first floor windows of Plot 4 will cover 85% of the rear garden of Bellami and Brierley and allow invasion of the privacy of the rear rooms.

The Design and Access Statement states the site is "well screened with trees and hedges providing good privacy to the adjacent properties", and the two dwellings "have been designed to minimise height and visual impact from neighbouring properties". These are not accurate statements. The tree and hedge screening referred to has been removed by the applicant and the rear rooms and garden of Bellami and Brierley are now overlooked by the property Greystone. Of course, the applicant was perfectly entitled to remove the screening, and the resulting overlooking impact has subsequently been mentioned by the Planning Officer.

Out of Character with the Surrounding Area - From an aerial view of the surrounding area there is not a single example of a development in the village having such a close proximity to a facing property as that being proposed. The development would set a new significant precedent for density of housing in the surrounding area. The properties in Hearts Delight are well spread out with no property having a dwelling 13 metres from the rear of their property, overbearing and blocking light in the way that this proposed development would to Wykeham.

Traffic - There will be a significant increase in vehicle movements in and out of Greystone, as

clearly highlighted by the amount of parking provided for the size of the properties. Local residents were very vocal about Bannister Hill as a danger point and whilst we appreciate the need for expert guidance from Highways, local residents are the ones rebuilding their walls and dealing with near misses on a frequent basis. The location of the access point is a crux point on Bannister Hill and simply is not suitable for the proposed number of vehicles coming in and out of it onto the hill. Despite the majority of surrounding properties all raising concerns regarding the traffic, the damage to the rural lane along Hearts Delight, the banks falling into the roads, having potentially 10 plus vehicles using an access point that was previously only used by one car is a dramatic increase and can only make the current situation worse. I understood from the Planning Meeting on 9th November a Traffic Report on Bannister Hill/Hearts Delight was to be commissioned, this is urgently needed.

Conservation Area - In the Local Plan, 7.8.4 of DM33 'Development affecting a conservation area' states the following: "...The character of conservation areas can be fragile, and their distinctive quality and character can be damaged by new development, or by other more subtle means such as increased traffic..." This is extremely relevant given that the access point for Greystones site is within Harman's Corner and work has already been undertaken to the access point that is within the conservation area that has caused problems with the bank as raised at the site meeting by a local resident. Whilst the proposed property may not be within the conservation area, if work is being done on the entrance that is within the conservation area at the expense of the view in and out of the conservation area then this should not be accepted especially as an independent report has already suggested the splays should be greater than what was previously suggested which will only result in further changes to the conservation area.

The plans are in direct conflict with CP3, CP4, DM14, DM33 and DM26.

Environment and Local Habitat - I cannot understand why Greystones, which is a perfectly sound house is proposed to be demolished, this house should remain and be refurbished. Demolishing a perfectly sound house will impact on CO2 emissions and effect the Carbon Footprint of the Swale area. There are badgers, bats and other wildlife species in the area which currently occupy the local gardens, these will be impacted on the overdevelopment and shoe horning of properties into small areas will result in the species being driven out of their local habitat.

I would strongly urge the planning committee to reject the Greystone proposal