

Thank you for the letter regarding yet another set of revised plans. As first I thought it was a game of spot the difference but then I read the email from Rob Duncan and can see it is just some minor amendments to these plans, so no major changes from my last comments:

- This application is unlawful
- The amendments made from the original outline are considerable and constitute a material change – taken from the web:

Material changes, for which a fresh application might be required could include:

- *Significantly increasing its size.*
- *Changes to windows or other openings that impact on neighbouring properties.*
- *Changes that alter the description of development.*
- *Changes to the application site area.*
- *Significant alterations to design or the siting of the proposals.*
- *Changes that would affect objections to the original proposal.*

- The houses are now significantly larger in size and scale
- The heights have changed on all properties with the single story garages being removed and replaced by double story extensions
- There have been changes to the application site area – and more changes required. The applicant is in receipt of a report from a land surveyor in which the legal red line differs from these plans.
- There have been significant alterations to the design and siting, with the homes almost doubling in size
- All homes approved at outline had three parking spaces, including a garage. Garages have now been removed and only two car parking spaces provided for plots 2 and 3. SCC highways state **"The parking and turning areas shall thereafter be retained unobstructed as parking and turning areas for the life of the development"**. I take it whoever moves into these homes will never have any guests because there will be nowhere safe for them to park, without obstructing the turning circle, under these current plans
- In the original plans, our land was used in the planning application but we were not named in certificate B, nor was notice served. Our land was originally classed as the access and turning circle - this has since been amended but only after outline planning permission was granted. Taken from the government website:

An application is not valid, and therefore cannot be determined by the local planning authority, unless the relevant certificate has been completed. It is an offence to complete a false or misleading certificate, either knowingly or recklessly, with a maximum fine of up to £5,000.

Essentially planning was given on an application that was not valid. We did raise land ownership prior to the outline planning permission being granted.

- The layout is not in-keeping with the surrounding area with very little garden area to the front

It really wouldn't matter if you were recreating Buckingham Palace because the fact remains that outline planning permission was based on false and misleading information.

I would also like to question why the planning officer has had this information since March 2023 yet this has only just been actioned, almost three months later. With yet another 14 day consultation period, what is the likelihood that the planning meeting will be moved for the 11th time?

There still also remains the outstanding issue of a drainage report which has not yet materialised – no doubt consultation on that will push the meeting back again.

Tracy Smith