

Further objection to changes to number 34

I would like to object strongly to APP/24/00191 with its new proposals.

All previous objections still stand.

I would first like to raise the question - why demolish a perfectly good double garage with blocked paving driveway and a dropped kerb, to just replicate on the other side of the property.

I do not consider that this application can be treated on its own merits. Numerous applications have already been submitted and withdrawn for a new build to go into this plot. The ground has already been prepared, building materials are in situ and the owner is a builder. If it is not the intention to resubmit for a new build on the plot, then moving the garage is not effective and will make the plot look very unbalanced and cramped to one side and not at all in keeping with the rest of the street. The change of footprint remains unnecessary and will involve removing the very last tree and patch of grass, effecting the ecology of the area even more than the damage that has already been done, which has already had a detrimental effect on wildlife and a detrimental visual effect, again, not in keeping with the rest of the street. Impermeable surfaced or paved areas should be minimised to reduce surface water run-off. This fact appears to have been ignored by this application.

Furthermore, the drawings do not show what he intends to do with the space where the existing garage stands and the rest of the plot that he has completely destroyed and is currently using to store building materials and building a massive bonfire. Is the scribbling around the edges supposed to be hedges? We already know that this is not possible in front of number 34 due to the new very large expanse of hard standing already installed outside of the property. The new plans are still unclear and poorly drawn, with no evidence of the accuracy of the measurements. Moving the garage will give an overall effect of loss of space between numbers 33 and 34. This will result in one of the main features of our road being lost and the two properties will look terraced rather than detached. Also, it is NOT a feature of the street to have 2 driveways side by side. With only one metre between them, (assuming the accuracy of the drawings) this could cause issues with loading and unloading vehicles for both residents at 33 and 34.

An even wider dropped kerb, means even less on street parking which will be detrimental to this end of the street as on street parking is already restricted at this end. It will also have a knock-on effect for the entire street, which is already suffering from increased on road parking.

Entering and leaving the driveway to number 6 will become difficult and dangerous with the new proposed driveway being exactly opposite each other - again not a feature of the road. Driveways are staggered for the ease of all residents.

There will also be an invasion of privacy as the windows in the plans would result in the feeling of being very much overlooked and a significant loss in the level of sunlight and daylight. This would also effect property values.

The impact and noise during demolition and construction, along with the lorries and mess would be very stressful and cause a lot of inconvenience, disruption, stress and anxiety and be detrimental to mental health and well-being. Potentially, we would not be able to use the front gardens, or open our windows.

This application does not leave the area improved in the slightest and is not in keeping with the rest of the street. It will be hard standings from edge to edge of the plot. The view will change from what was a beautiful well tended front garden, to nothing more than a car park. This is not better for the residents of the street or the environment, or in the interests of sustainability.

"Biodiversity net gain (BNG) is an approach to development that aims to leave the natural environment in a measurably better state than it was before the development took place." This application is already in deficit regarding BNG.

Lastly, it is totally unnecessary to knock down a perfectly good double garage and rebuild the other side, bearing in mind the huge hard standing that has already been added to the front of the property. The extra rooms, can be added behind and over the existing garage, and be far more in keeping with the rest of the street, and be more aesthetically pleasing. It would also save the last remaining patch of green which would be far better for the environment.

This must be rejected.

Thank you