Objection DC/25/0037 & DC/25/0038

Sub-division of Heritage Asset - we refer to the Conservation Officers comments whose recommendation is still for the house to remain as a single dwelling and only if it is accepted by the planning department to be the only viable option for the future of the heritage asset should the development be allowed.

Although the developer insists that the sub-division will guarantee the future of the heritage asset there is no evidence provided in the application to support this. What demand will there be for these proposed leasehold units? Although there are benefits from shared facilities these come at a cost and the proposals do not provide for any garaging (although sufficient is existing) outdoor storage or privacy which you would expect with houses of this size. The most viable option would be for the asset to be marketed as a single dwelling at a price that reflects current demand, taking into account poor condition and upkeep.

Conversion of garages, workshop and store above - the application refers to this building as garages with flat above (also sometimes referred to as garden flat or guest cottage). There is no evidence of planning permission or established lawful use as residential for this building. The developer is obviously aware that application DC/13/1287 refused permission for residential use on the basis that the site is outside the limits of any existing town or village and the development, if permitted, would consolidate an undesirable element of sporadic development in a rural area which would result in visual intrusion into the countryside to the detriment of the rural character of the area.

If this current application is to seek planning approval both for residential use and the conversion of the building to a three-bedroom cottage then the same reasons for refusal I assume would be applicable today.

Visual Amenity - the proposed split and new dwelling constitute over development and will not only have an adverse effect on the setting of the listed building as stated by the conservation officer but harm to the amenity of our property, our neighbour's listed property and the users of the bridleway.

Allocating private gardens and areas to each of the units will affect the parklike landscaping, allowing the new residents to apply their own individual style to their gardens.

The increase in activity generated by increased households, along with the additional traffic movements create an increase in noise and disturbance. All combining in our amenities being significantly harmed.

Traffic movements - despite the claim that traffic will decrease I would suggest that there will be a significant increase that would compromise the road safety for vehicles, pedestrians, cyclists and other vulnerable users of the lane.

The claim that vehicle movements will be reduced is incorrect. There seems to be the assumption that the owners of 7/8 bedroom homes will have no requirement to use available space for live-in nannies, for caring for elderly family members or office use. Plus, all existing traffic movements to service communal gardens, pool and tennis court maintenance remain the same.

The increase in residents would lead to a material and harmful intensification of use and associated activity, which would be to the detriment of existing road users and the quiet,

tranquil enjoyment of Lock Lane as a private access drive for existing residents and bridleway users.

Road Safety -The track is a single lane, no lighting, mostly dropping off to ditches, no footpath (pedestrians generally walk in the middle of the lane) and already has an issue with a weak bridge that has not been provided with a long- term solution.

Additionally, there is no formal access/egress route for our properties when the river floods. The Transport Statement produced by the developer states that there is an alternative route when the area floods. This is incorrect and this alternative route is only allowed as a goodwill gesture to existing residents and as such could be easily withdrawn at any time.

Although the developer states that access to the property is to be mainly via the main entrance gates there is a right of way from the rear of the property. This rear access is a narrow single farm track and footpath with a sharp blind bend that needs to be approached with extreme caution to avoid collision. If domestic traffic from the development is permitted the increased traffic movements will significantly increase the risk of a collision with both vehicles and pedestrians and generate unacceptable increase in noise and disturbance.