

## **Clarification on Neighbour Amenity**

### **For Committee Members**

Dear Councillor,

I am writing to offer further clarification on a few points that have circulated online ahead of Thursday's committee.

I work independently from the Promoter/Developer and represent the landowners. I have detailed knowledge of the property stretching back over 11 years

I completely understand the sensitivity of any story involving an elderly neighbour and the gravity of a helpful, concerned MP. I want to present the factual position calmly and respectfully to ensure Members have accurate information ahead of the vote without emotive framing.

#### **1. Access to shops, buses and village services remains exactly the same.**

The new access road does not affect Joy's route to any services or local facilities. The only change is that she would need to cross the new road only if she chose to visit the four houses, on her side of her cul-de-sac. WSCC Highways have confirmed the design is safe.

#### **2. Existing privacy impact is severe. The proposal removes it entirely**

There is currently a first-floor balcony only approx. 4m from her garden boundary, with a direct, elevated view over her garden.

This is a substantial amenity impact.

Under the proposal:

- That property (and balcony) is demolished. It has a >4m high, elevated view across the entire garden, from less than 2m from the boundary (see attached).
- The rear of nearest proposed dwelling is approx. **27m away** from Joy.

- The line of sight sits at an oblique angle of roughly 49°, significantly more deflected than the type of direct angle SPDs seek to avoid when referencing 45° tests.

In planning terms, this represents a clear and material improvement in privacy and amenity.

### **3. This type of local change is not new**

Around 2014, the other half of what was then her semi-detached home was demolished to form the access to the Burleigh Woods development. This process converted her home into the detached bungalow it is today.

That was a far more invasive intervention than the current proposal. It required the complete reconstruction of her external side wall, tied into the internal fabric of the building, while the retired occupant remained in situ.

### **4. The proposals improve amenity and local character.**

The intrusive balcony is removed, new landscaping and buffering are introduced. Route to services unchanged, and privacy improves. Though not a material planning consideration, the overall effect will enhance the property's amenity and value.

Some online statements suggest Joy is isolated or visually compromised. Based on measured distances and angles, the opposite is true: privacy improves, access is unaffected, and her overall environment is enhanced.

### **5. I am concerned that Joy has been used as a focal point by campaigners.**

Some of the claims being made do not align with the actual physical conditions on site. I do not dismiss Joy's feelings; perceived harm can feel very real, and any change near a long-established home is unsettling.

However, it is important that Members are able to distinguish between understandable anxiety about change and the measurable impacts of the proposal. When those impacts are assessed objectively, they point clearly towards improvement rather than harm.

### **6. Visual summary enclosed**

A simple diagram is attached for Members; who may find spatial context helpful.

It illustrates:

- The 4m high, 2m horizontal distance of the existing balcony.
- The 27m distance of the closest, proposed house.
- The angle of view, confirming the proposed relationship is more distant and oblique.
- The proximity and severity of the overlooking balcony using Rightmove sales photos.

Thank you for taking the time to read this note. I felt it was important to provide these factual clarifications promptly, in light of some of the recent commentary circulating online. My intention is simply to ensure that Members have an accurate illustration.

