

## **Appendix B – Third Party Comments**

### **Initial Consultation;**

- The destruction and removal of the hedgerow adversely affecting the area visually and in terms of ecology;
- Impact on badgers and no evidence of an up-dated badger survey having been carried out;
- The removal of the hedgerow has altered the character of the village despite statements in the original approval it would be retained;
- Invasion of and loss of privacy;
- The height of the wall and dwelling are inappropriate;
- How is the building okay 3m plus higher than previously approved;
- Windows are on the west facing elevation that were not there on the approved west facing elevation;
- The removal of the hedge and its replacement with a wall will impact on ecology and the character of the conservation area;
- The location of the dwelling is different from that previously approved;
- The dwelling is overbearing and adversely impacts on amenity and privacy;
- It is out of character with and ruins the village skyline;
- It encroaches on land outside the applicants control through the lane to the side of the site;
- It will render the use of an adjacent garage incapable;
- A replacement native hedgerow should be planted in place of the proposed wall;
- The site is in a conservation where the development does not fully reflect its character;
- The plans provided do not match what is being constructed in terms of the embankment areas;
- The scale, size and style of the gates and boundary wall are out of keeping in the area;
- There have been a number of trees removed to the rear of the dwelling;
- Uncertainty that the proposed landscaping can be implemented due to the embankment;
- The increase and changes to ground levels is unreasonable and unnecessary while being filled with building matter; and
- Discrepancies between the proposed plans and what is being built including the slope of the land and footpath locations.

### **1<sup>st</sup> Amended Plan Re-consultation;**

2 letter from 2 addresses objecting on the grounds of;

-The frailties of the system are being exploited by making changes to the originally approved plans then applying for retrospective permission;

- I look down from both garden and cottage windows on the new site where the extensive raising of the land by infill has brought the new house much more fully into my view than was anticipated due to the ground level being raised substantially.

-The new house also impacts on the view as one enters Eaton on the Branston Road - again it is elevated far higher than anticipated by the original plans.

- Are extremely upset that the boundary hedge, of at least 100 years old, was ripped out (contrary to the original application statement) and it is now proposed that a wall be built on this boundary.

- The erection of a wall (of whatever material) on this boundary will increase the visual impact of the new build, and will be totally out of place on a lane which has, and did have, hedges all along the boundary.

- This plot lies within the conservation area boundary of the village, and any boundary should be erected in line with other surrounding extant boundaries.

-The original application states "2.02 The site is an infill plot between 29 Main Street and Spring Cottage. There is an existing substantial hedge between the highway and the application site. It is proposed to retain this existing hedge except where the new entrance will be created. The site falls away from the highway and the proposed dwelling is therefore only likely to be visible by way of glimpses through the new access in the hedge." The actions now taken: raising the ground level of the plot, removing the hedge and erecting a wall are contrary to these original application statements. If these elements are so important why were they not included as such in the first planning application - surely they could not have been outside of the thinking and planning of the architect at that time?

-In the new application section 1.01 to 1.06 suggest that the site for the house was always going to be raised to overcome access issues - this is clearly not the case in the original application where raising the site by a substantial number of meters is not identified at all - nor are cross section levels presented, as in the new application. In fact the original application states on page "11: The appearance of the proposed dwelling is intended to be sympathetic to this vernacular architecture and has been sequentially revised with the intention of decreasing the scale and visual impact of the proposed dwelling." If these issues had been identified I would have been far more concerned when the original application was submitted and would have made my concerns known then.