
From: Craig Shepherd
Sent: 30 August 2022 15:16
To: Planning (SMDC); Simpkin, Rachael.
Cc:
Subject: Fwd: Application SMD/2021/0456 - Additional Revised Information
Categories:

Begin forwarded message:

From: Craig Shepherd
Subject: Application SMD/2021/0456 - Additional Revised Information
Date: 30 August 2022 at 1:00:04 pm BST
To: Craig Shepherd

Further to SMDC letter dated 18/8/22, we would like to make the following observations and objections to the proposed amendments, relating principally to plots 66, 65 and 64 which directly impact on our properties 118 and 116 Ness Grove.

Ref. Section AB

- Plots 66, 65 and 64 have been built too close to existing properties on Ness Grove in relation to their height above finished floor level, thereby impacting on our privacy. As the FFL of these 3 plots is at least 2 metres higher than the FFL of existing properties 118 and 116 Ness Grove, these plots should have been built at least 4 metres further away.
- On the Section A-A drawing the slope and distance shown from plot 65 to the 0.9 metre Brick Retaining Wall and Bowtop railings is incorrect, as this wall has been built closer to the proposed dwelling at the end of a level flagged patio. The made-up ground in front of the steps is not at ground level as shown on the plan, but will be held back by gravel boards. The fence will then be placed on these gravel boards, but we believe this will not be sufficient to hold back the weight of the made-up ground. The fencing being installed today (30/8/22) will not be high enough to give us the privacy we demand.
- On Section A-A the existing site boundary is shown to the LEFT of the existing retained hedge - this is incorrect. The boundary should be the the RIGHT of the hedge as said hedge is part of the existing properties on Ness Grove.
- We object to the proposed planting of additional trees/hedging alongside the existing retained hedge as a method of screening between plots 66-64 and our properties. Such planting would need to be maintained over the years, but there is no indication as to who would be responsible for this. For precisely this reason the section of hedge behind 118 Ness Grove was removed more than 12 years ago and we do not want it replaced with more trees/hedges.
- We believe a better solution to the screening between the properties would be to extend the brick wall and fencing already built behind plot 66 to incorporate plots 65 and 64. Currently the wall and fence at plot 66 affords more privacy to our properties when viewed

from our FFL as it completely screens the ground floor windows and doors of plot 66. We would like to see this wall and fencing extended and applied to plots 65 and 64 at a similar height to plot 66, so that their ground floor windows and doors are completely screened too. This will maintain a certain degree of privacy for our properties which has otherwise been lost by the incorrect siting of these plots.

- The siting of plots 66-64 has not only impacted on our privacy, but by being too close and too high in relation to our properties has undoubtedly reduced the resale value of our 2 properties.

We would welcome a visit from a representative from SMDC Planning Department to view and discuss our concerns first hand.

Yours sincerely

Craig and Janet Shepherd - 118 Ness Grove
Derick and Valerie Betteley - 116 Ness Grove