

SUPPLEMENTARY COMMENTS

**ROSEHILL
NABB LANE, ALTON**

OCTOBER 2024

1 Comments on LPA Statement of Case

- 1.1 In paragraph 7.2 the Local Authority continues to assert that the appeal site is within a former orchard that contributes to the character, density and pattern of development along Nabb Lane. For avoidance of doubt it should be noted that neither of the proposed holiday lodges are to be located in that former orchard area, as discussed in paragraphs 7.1 – 7.3 of the Grounds of Appeal. Only the pathway passes through that area, but that development has already been approved as part of the previous application for holiday accommodation on the site.
- 1.2 In paragraph 7.3 the Local Authority raises concerns that the proposal would result in a greater density of development than if they were placed within the orchard / garden area (to which they had objected), and contend that the development is out-of-keeping with the character of the rural area. We disagree. The holiday lodges will be well hidden from public view, and be located within the domestic curtilage of the dwelling, tucked in behind the existing dwelling. The Local Authority's own delegated report observed that this would make them less visible (see paragraph 7.5 of the Grounds of Appeal) and also notes in its appeal statement that the units would be clustered together "in a neat and compact uniform row". We consequently disagree that this proposal would be harmful to the character of the area.
- 1.3 In paragraph 7.4 the Local Authority reasserts its belief that the lodges would appear incongruous and out-of-place in this locality, which is somewhat perplexing as they are of not dissimilar design to the lodge they have previously approved on the site and which is more visually conspicuous. The timber cladding of the lodges reinforces their incidental appearance in relation to the dwellinghouse, and will appear muted in its rural surroundings whilst occupying a discreet position within the site.

- 1.4 We note that the Local Authority's Statement of Case has not persisted with any of the objections raised in its delegated report about the impact of the development on nearby heritage assets. One assumes this is in recognition of the conclusions of the Heritage Statement as set out in the Grounds of Appeal.
- 1.5 In paragraph 7.7 the Local Authority contends that the development will lie within 7.7m of the shared boundary with Ash Croft. That property is, however, separated from the appeal site by existing boundary vegetation and domestic outbuildings. The neighbouring property itself lies at least 46 metres away from the site and also has a substantial curtilage. Owing to the siting of the proposed lodges away from that property, we submit that no material harm to neighbouring amenity will arise as a consequence of the development. We also re-assert that the Environmental Health Officer, who has responsibility for policing noise complaints, has raised no objection to the proposal.
- 1.6 The Local Authority appears to have given no consideration to the benefits of the development in delivering new tourism accommodation within the District in line with the adopted Churnet Valley Master Plan and the adopted Tourism Strategy (see paragraphs 7.18 – 7.24 of the Grounds of Appeal). We submit that these benefits carry significant weight in favour of planning permission being granted.

2 Comments on 3rd Party Representations

- 2.1 The third party representations raise a number of issues which I summarise below along with our associated commentary thereon:
- 2.2 Heritage Impact: For the reasons set out within the Heritage Statement accompanying the application and the very discreet location of the proposed lodges, we contend that the development will not result in any harm to the

significance of nearby heritage assets. We consequently submit that these concerns do not warrant dismissal of the appeal.

2.3 Need for Tourism Accommodation: it is contended that the need for tourism accommodation in the Alton area is already met, but no evidence is provided as to how they have arrived at this conclusion. The Local Authority does not share that view, concluding that there *is a demand* for more tourism accommodation in general and that the proposal would widen the range of type of tourist accommodation on offer within the Alton area, in line with the objectives of the Churnet Valley Master Plan and the adopted Tourism Strategy (see paragraphs 7.18 – 7.24 of the Grounds of Appeal). We consequently submit that these concerns do not warrant dismissal of the appeal.

2.4 Harm to Amenity: This matter is considered within the Grounds of Appeal, and we wish to highlight that the neighbouring property lies a considerable distance from the site, and that there is intervening vegetation and outbuildings located in between the holiday accommodation and the garden of that property. Concern is raised that the accommodation may give rise to their use by larger groups such as stag / hen parties, and I can confirm the appellant's agreement to the imposition of a planning condition precluding the use of the holiday accommodation by such groups. The appellant lives next door also and has no interest in attracting large groups to the site. We consequently submit that these concerns do not warrant dismissal of the appeal.

2.5 Highway Safety: Concerns are raised about increasing traffic along Nabb Lane, inadequate visibility, that the nearby junction is dangerous, that there is insufficient parking, and that this is an unsustainable location. There is ample parking space within the site, along with room to turn vehicles, with scope to provide additional parking spaces if necessary. We nevertheless draw attention in this regard to the conclusions of both the Local Highway Authority

and the Local Authority who have confirmed that the development is acceptable from a highway safety perspective and that it is a sustainable location for such development. We consequently submit that these concerns do not warrant dismissal of the appeal.

2.6 Impact on the Character of the Area: This matter is discussed at length within the Grounds of Appeal, and we submit that no material harm will arise. We consequently submit that these concerns do not warrant dismissal of the appeal.

2.7 Drainage: Concerns are raised about an absence of drainage details. The foul waste from the holiday accommodation will drain to a package treatment plant that will be located on land to the northeast of the site, where there is already a separate package treatment plant serving the approved holiday accommodation adjacent. The house has its own, separate septic tank which is unaffected by the development. Surface water will drain to soakaways. Condition 16 as recommended by the Local Authority addresses this matter. We consequently submit that these concerns do not warrant dismissal of the appeal.

2.8 Other Matters: Various other matters are raised within the letters of representation, which either constitute opinions or have not been substantiated by any evidence, and / or have been found to be acceptable to the Local Authority. We consequently submit that these concerns do not warrant dismissal of the appeal.

3 Recommended Conditions

3.1 There are no objections to the conditions recommended by the Local Authority.