30th November 2020

Alison Lee

Thornicks Cottage,

Park Lane,

Ipstones,

ST10 2ND

To Planning Support Customer Services,

Concerns re:

Proposed Development: Outline application for all matters reserved for new detached dwelling and garage in the garden of application site.

Location: Tollbar Cottage 70 High Street, Ipstones

Application Number: SMD/2020/0594

1. Firstly, the area proposed the Tollbar Cottage, 70 High Street, Ipstones is on the market for sale. The sale documents show that the sale doesn't include the rear land at 70, High Street, Ipstones, therefore the land which is being proposed for a dwelling shows the dwelling and entrance will actually be off Park Lane and not High Street.
   This area proposed is in the countryside along Park Lane, P.P.S.7. makes it clear that isolated new houses in the countryside require special justification for planning permission to be granted of which in this proposal I am unable to see any.

2. Secondly the proposed plans show a new entrance being made across Park Lane. There is already a large entrance at the rear of Tollbar Cottage which could easily be used to gain access to the proposed dwelling. Has planning Policy Guidance 2 says countryside areas must be protected and it maintains the presumption against this type of development. It states the aim is to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

Also as people approach Ipstones, the countryside along Park Lane can clearly be seen. My Dyers proposal includes taking out a stone wall, bushes along this Lane to make a new access- in my view this will alter the character and beauty along the Lane and I object against this.

P.P.S.1. states that new buildings in the countryside should be strictly controlled and discusses the governments aims to ensure that the quality, intrinsic character, beauty and landscapes of the countryside is protected so it may be enjoyed by all.
(With the Pandemic of 2020 I think this has to be shown to be more important than ever)

I am concerned that the plans show NO measurements, it is imperative the outline plans for the proposed dwelling has measurements of height, width and its actual siting to ensure it will not alter the character and landscape of the countryside.

Looking at the plans they show an inaccuracy, they show my garage built to the border which is incorrect as there is space for me to walk around my garage.

3. Thirdly, the proposed site next to my border, has a group of large trees with a preservation order on. As you are aware because of the preservation order I am legally responsible for these, previously the local council have worked with the Tree Surgeon to ensure that the trees were trimmed correctly to maintain their contour and shape so that they preserved the view, character and landscape in this part of the countryside.
   My concern is that these trees have been missed off the proposed plans. Looking at the plans the dwelling appears to be proposed in the centre of the plot but my concern is that there are NO measurements included of how far away the proposed dwelling is to be built. As you'll be aware in the ' Tree Roots in the Built Environment, Good Planning and Guidance' it highlights the ease of which trees can be damaged and killed by adversely affecting their rooting environment- an area so often ignored.

4. Also there are NO main drains across Park Lane and the plans proposed haven't mentioned this, therefore I presume it would need a ? septic

tank and where would this be situated? The proposed dwelling and possibly septic tank needs to have measurements of exactly how far away from the protected Trees so that they are not damaged and any diggings of footings will not adversely affect these trees.

5. Fifthly, Mr Dwyer is presently selling his property on High Street and is splitting his land to the rear of his property to put in for planning for a dwelling off Park Lane which is outside the Village Boundary, even though previously there might have been a potential building plot off High Street as infill as the numbers go from 66-70 but he extended his house onto this site.

   The area proposed for the dwelling the local council at the meeting 25th November assured me is still outside the Village Boundary.

6. Finally, the proposed site has previously been turned down in 1988 – a Mr Mason applied for local businessman Andrew Simmill and it was turned down on the grounds of 'Ribbon Development' as it was on the Park Lane border. Mr Sutcliffe was Chief of Planning at that time.

   The proposed site was also turned down in 2008 when My Glyn Dwyer previously applied. He appealed against the decision and the decision was withheld. The reasoning being:-

   Reason 1. The site is outside the village development boundary

   Reason 2. The proposed development would have an impact on the loss of openness and will have an impact on the character and appearance of the Special landscape area etc.

Many thanks for your time and consideration to my concerns.

Kind Regards,

Alison Lee