

Further to your letters dated 08.05.24. i wish to raise the following points and further object to APP/24/00190 & APP/24/00191

A revised block plan and revised parking plan. Neither of these documents highlight the changes from earlier plans and the revisions make no difference to the objections that have already been raised by myself and the majority of other residents of Pennant Hills. The new applications are of poor quality, are very unclear and unprofessional looking and almost useless in gauging space and access issues around parking.

Hedges are shown in front of number 34. How is this possible as there is no space between the new hard standing and the pavement. Also if this was to go ahead, how would it be monitored and enforced? The bigger dropped kerbs just mean even less on street parking, in a section of the road where on street parking is severely limited. Also, the widening of the dropped kerb at 34a does not make the plot any larger for a building or any more safer for cars to enter and exit the plot which still remains on a blind bend. Whether cars drive in front ways or reverse in they will either be reversing on a blind corner or have to do a wide u turn crossing over to the wrong side of the road again on a blind bend.

In reality, number 34 will not use the proposed new garage as have failed to use the full size double garage already attached to the property. They will probably continue to use the hard-standing outside of the property, which makes for a very dangerous and awkward maneuver on entering and leaving, especially if they wont have the existing drive way to use, and there would be other vehicles parked on the new driveway. Therefore, i would expect that the whole length of the hard standing would also need to be a dropped kerb, taking away the last space for on street parking. Parking and circulation layouts should aim to provide a safe, convenient pattern of movement into, across and out of a site, this clearly fails to meet this requirement.

It is unlikely that 7 cars will park in their allotted spaces. Garages are rarely used for cars and parking behind each other is not convenient at all and it would be very unsafe to be shuffling the cars on the blind bend. Therefore, there will be extra cars looking for spaces, which will impact on the whole street. Also the tandem space fails to specify a length which means it is not possible to say it conforms with the HBCPSPD.

The change of footprint to 34 remains unnecessary ie knocking down an established garage, cutting down the last remaining tree, removing the last patch of grass and moving the driveway which will again impact several homes and free movement of vehicles.

From number 33 drive way to the end of plot 34a, a once beautiful and prominent plot, would now be reduced to a concrete jungle with very untidy parking, the overall effect being a complete eyesore and totally not in-keeping with the rest of the street.

There is still no reference to existing telephone poles, broadband housing, and the repair of the wall to the rear of the property Portsdown Hill Rd.

both applications (APP/24/00190 and APP/24/00191) still fail on all the following issues:

landscaping

Road safety-traffic and parking

affect on the area

affect on ecology of the area.

loss of privacy

loss of light

loss of scenery

loss of property value

impact during construction

noise during construction

34a - Elevations and spacing do not appear to be in keeping with the character of existing dwellings/the street.

Strain on infrastructure and services

Out of character with the rest of the street

sustainability

Building

As set out in the Borough Design Guide, all new dwellings should have 10m rear garden. The proposed development does not adhere to this ruling.

For ground covering permeable solutions should be used wherever practicable.

Impermeable surfaced or paved areas should be minimised to reduce surface water run-off.

- This fact appears to have been ignored by the installation of the new drive at number 34.

Drainage Strategy (Surface Water and SuDS) and Foul Sewage Assessment

The proposed development will at a minimum have requirements to connect or make changes to the existing sewage and storm water systems. As such, details of the existing systems should be shown on the application drawings (yet they are not) and a Foul Sewage Assessment is required.

Achieving Biodiversity Net Gain - no plans to rectify mature garden of trees, shrubs and bushes which were raised to the ground prematurely. The addition of the hedges, although a step in the right direction, is purely too little too late, again providing only lip service to one of the requirements.

In this case, everyone in the street that were aware of the applications have objected. Sadly, some residents were not made aware and therefore unable to object, although everyone will be effected mainly by additional on street parking, access in and out of the street, noise, loss of character in the street, road safety etc, etc.

This is a poorly planned over development of a prominent site for Pennant Hills. We have already lost valuable wildlife habitat and green outlook with the eradication of what was a valuable wildlife rich mature garden. To have it replaced by more bricks, hard standing,

vehicles and traffic and the added pressures on our services and water table by a 4-bedroom family house that does not even meet the requirements needed for such a dwelling would not be in the interest of all the residents of Pennant Hills and could have long reaching consequences. If approved the decision would not be in keeping with HBC planning policy regarding Biodiversity net gain - "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 site is already in deficit regarding BNG which should apply to every development of a site regardless of size.

The impact of loss of privacy, light and outlook from both there proposals is severe and must be taken seriously, as must the detrimental effect on property values, and the overall effect of the street. Also the impact of lifestyle, mental health, stress and well-being which will be deeply effected if the inconsiderate parking, noise, rubbish left on the road etc during the refurbishment of 34 if that is anything to go by.

The objections must be taken seriously, as it effects so many in so many ways. We now have the backing of an elected councilor. In her words - both applications MUST be red-carded.