

I have the following additional comments in relation to the latest additional documents submitted, RE your recent letter.

1. Previous work between the developer and planning resulted in the property designs for all four plots being modified to reduce the roof height, this is evident in drawing 16A_071020. Plot one ridge height was reduced from 48.92 to 48.34, a reduction in 580mm. This I believe was a condition to the planning approval. The latest designs however have increased the ridge height beyond the original design from 48.34 to 49.06, an increase of 720mm. This cannot be acceptable based on the precedence and would provide dispute for the previous applications. This increase will have significant impact to the houses on Billett Avenue and Round way. I recommend the planning officer visit some of the houses on Round Way and see the impact of the development and the effect house height will have on their;
 - a. Loss of light/overshadowing
 - b. Loss of privacy
 - c. Noise and disturbance resulting from use
 - d. Visual amenity

These will also affect many houses on Billett Avenue and the Grove to varying degrees.

1. The gap between the new property design and Plot 2 has reduced to ~500mm. This will impact plot 2 in terms of;
 - a. Loss of light/overshadowing
 - b. **Layout and density of building**
 - c. Noise and disturbance resulting from use
 - d. **Previous planning decisions (including appeal decisions)**
 - e. Visual amenity
2. Billett Avenue has just had the road fully repaired, at great cost to the residents as it's a private road. The developments of plots 2 to 4 contributed significantly to the roads decline, unfortunately the condition became near unusable and therefore immediate action was required. It has been the residents of Billett Avenue and The Grove that have had to foot this significant cost. In fairness to all members of Billett Avenue and the Grove, it would be appreciated (once a suitable planning resolution is reached) if a condition is added that any damage from construction to the road is repaired, such that the road is returned to it current state.

In summary and referring to my previous letters, valid objections are raised in accordance with the following material planning considerations:

- **Adequacy of parking/loading/turning**
- **Conflict with planning policies**

- Design, appearance and materials
- Loss of light/overshadowing
- Loss of privacy
- **Layout and density of building**
- Noise and disturbance resulting from use
- **Previous planning decisions (including appeal decisions)**
- Proposals/policies in the development plan
- Road access
- Traffic generation
- Visual amenity

We also have the noted errors from the AMS/AIA Tree plans in terms of Tree RPA this has also led to errors on some plans. See previous correspondence for corrections required.

Regards,