

## Sarah Valentine

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 26 November 2025 15:52  
**To:** planninginfo  
**Subject:** Objection

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

2 Oakfield  
London Road  
Sayers Common  
BN69HT

26th November 2025

Planning Department

Re: Objection to Planning Application

Coombe farm - DM/25/2661

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to lodge my formal objection to the above planning application. Having reviewed the proposals, I have significant concerns regarding the impact this development would have on the character, environment, and long-term sustainability of the area.

### 1. Coalescence of Settlements and Loss of Green Space

The development contributes directly to the coalescence of nearby villages, eroding the essential green gaps that maintain their individual identities. These open spaces are fundamental to preserving rural character, landscape integrity, and the wellbeing of residents who rely on accessible natural areas.

## 2. Loss of Place and Local Character

The proposal undermines the established sense of place that defines the surrounding settlements. The scale, form, and density of the development are not in keeping with the traditional village setting, resulting in a development that risks feeling disconnected, intrusive, and out of context.

## 3. Interruption to Important Views, Including Listed Buildings

The planned construction will significantly interrupt protected and valued views, particularly those involving nearby listed buildings. These heritage assets rely on their surrounding landscape for setting and significance, and the proposed scheme would cause clear visual harm.

## 4. Height and Visual Impact of Three-Storey Buildings on Elevated Land

The inclusion of three-storey buildings on a hillside is wholly inappropriate. Their height and position would greatly amplify visual intrusion, dominating the skyline, harming long-distance views, and creating an overbearing presence for existing residents.

## 5. Active Travel England Requirements Not Met

The application references walking and cycling improvements, yet provides no clear evidence of safe, continuous, and usable routes to meaningful destinations. Without proper connections to schools, shops, transport hubs, and neighbouring villages, these claims do not satisfy Active Travel England's standards for active travel infrastructure.

## 6. Biodiversity Impacts Not Adequately Addressed

While the applicant makes brief references to biodiversity, the proposal fails to demonstrate how significant biodiversity on the site will be protected, enhanced, or meaningfully compensated. The area supports a variety of species, habitats, and ecological networks that would be negatively affected without robust, evidence-based mitigation plans.

## 7. Flooding Concerns and Lack of Clear Guarantees

Given the site's drainage characteristics and local flood history, it is essential to have an absolute guarantee that the development will not increase flood risk either on-site or downstream. The documents provided do not offer sufficient assurance or detail regarding long-term drainage capacity, sustainable urban drainage systems (SuDS), or resilience to future climate impacts.

For these reasons, I strongly urge the council to refuse this application. The cumulative effects on landscape, heritage, character, biodiversity, and local infrastructure are substantial and unacceptable.

Thank you for considering my objection. I trust that these concerns will be given full and serious weight in your decision-making process.

Yours faithfully,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact a handwritten signature.