



Late Observations Sheet
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE
20 May 2014 at 7.00 pm

Late Observations

This page is intentionally left blank

Development Control Committee 20th May 2014

SE/14/00188/FUL, Land to the West of 9 Mount Harry Road

Notes from Cllr Simon Raikes, Ward Councillor who requested that this be brought to DC

First, my apologies for not being here in person. I have an official engagement which predates this agenda so am unable to attend.

There have been previous proposals to redevelop this site, which was originally occupied by one residence. SDC agreed to the erection of one new house but declined a proposal to have two houses erected on what was a single site. This refusal was upheld by the Planning Inspector for the reason set out by the planning officer in paragraph 42 on page 115. This is however a new application.

The Residential Character Area Assessment section F04 sets out amongst the positive features of Mount Harry Road:

“Individually designed mostly 2 storey detached houses are set back from the road along a relatively regular building line with gaps between buildings”

Furthermore it quotes as negative features:

“Some new development has not respected the characteristic set back from the road or allowed spacing between buildings”

Different parts of Mount Harry exhibit different characteristics, but it would be fair to say that the South side between Pendennis and Woodside Road is characterised by large two storey buildings which carry the appearance of being well set apart and with large frontages and large gardens to the rear. Single storey garages to the side of the buildings reinforce the feeling of spaciousness, or gaps referred to in the RCAA

The application proposes a second substantial two and a half storey building (albeit disguised by the use of Velux windows to the front) on the original single site, filling most of the remaining width of the plot and eliminating the appearance of spaciousness between it and nos 9 and 11. This would have an adverse impact on the street scene and reflect the negative features found in the RCAA. It would also arguably be contrary to the design guidance set out in the RCAA which states inter alia that:

“Some infill development and redevelopment has occurred in this character area and there is limited potential for further such development and the area is likely to remain largely unchanged over time.”

(My underlining)

It should be noted that the frontages of 9 and 9A will be much narrower than the houses from no 11 westwards to Woodside Road if this development were to proceed, contrary to the character of the houses in this part of the road and thus also having an adverse impact on the street scene.

It should be noted that the existing houses also have substantial gardens and whilst it is argued that site coverage is similar to other houses, the site coverage in relation to plot size is substantially reduced. I therefore maintain that in the context of the neighbouring houses this application

Agenda Item

represents overdevelopment of the site, and with the need to take account of the substantial tree on the site of no 9, it will restrict the amenity space for occupants of the new house.

I therefore ask members to refuse the application as it:

1. Does not meet the standards set out in section F04 of the Residential Character Area Assessment
2. It is injurious to the street scene
3. It would have an overbearing impact of neighbouring properties
4. It does not provide adequate amenity space for a house of this size