







APPENDIX 1

PLANNING APPLICATION LBA/425/1 FOR THE ORCHARD, HOLBORN HILL

RESPONSE OF LETCOMBE BASSETT PARISH MEETING

The meeting was attended by 22 parishioners, including 10 households who are adjacent or opposite to the proposed development. The meeting voted unanimously that they were not happy with the plans as presented.

Reasons for objection:

- 1) It is a small site and the proposed development is too big for the plot. It is considered to represent a significant overdevelopment of the site which is compounded by the proposed change in height of the building.
- 2) The documentation suggested that the proposed extension will not be visible from the road. The meeting believes that it will be possible to see it because of the increased height of the building.
- 3) The nature of the design is unsuitable for the village, which is a conservation area within an "Area of Natural Beauty". Any development of the existing bungalow should aim to improve the character of the building.
- 3) The site is steeply sloping and will need considerable excavation for the proposed new extension and parking. The parish is concerned about the stability of the remaining bank, especially in wet weather. They are also concerned for the adjacent trees.
- 4) There is no indication that the boundary will be landscaped and there appears to be no room for planting. The Meeting would request a condition on any planning permission that might be granted, for agreed boundary planting on all sides.
- 5) The proposed first floor windows will look straight into the bedroom windows of the house opposite and all the house opposite and adjacent will suffer loss of privacy and a deterioration in their view.

The Meeting requests that there should be a site visit by the planning committee so that they can understand the special characteristics and particular problems of the site.

They were also concerned that a) not all the households affected had received letters from the Council, b) the different scales used on the plans for existing and proposed was misleading, and c) there was no height given for the proposed new roof ridge.

28/6/08
Julie Davenport (Clerk)