

Mrs A Dye

245 Long Road  
Lowestoft  
Suffolk  
NR33 9DF  
DC/19/5063/VOC

31 March 2020

Planning committee members

I note, as always, further amendments were made to this proposal on 7th Feb and 19 March. The first amendment in the form of moving the property 1 metre forward and replacing a back bedroom with the bathroom. However, the depth and width of the property which is proposed by half a meter in both directions has further increased its overall size from 23% to 25% bigger than that already approved. I might add in Nov 2018 the planning committee refused this increase on the basis of its overbearing nature and bulk. Furthermore increasing the eaves height from 2.35 to 4 metres is further increasing the overshadowing to 245, this was also a basis for refusal in Nov when the eaves height was proposed to increase from 2.35 to 3.35.

At the referral committee the planning officer stated “it is not considered that the increased footprint, eaves height of the dwelling would result in adverse impact” his statement has clearly not considered the comments from the resident at 245, the local councillors or the overwhelming refusal of the planning committee for lesser plans, which were refused in Nov 2018 where all parties felt there will be adverse impact.

The proposed increase in eaves height by 1.7metres and the increase in dimensions is likely to cause light loss for 245 and it is the resident at 245 who has the right to comment on the detriment to their living conditions this will make which will be significant to them. Loss of light is a reason to refuse and I appeal to you all to consider this.

Whilst moving the property forward the proposal is now closer to 245. It was documented and acknowledged at referral that some additional impact on amenity may arise. This is not “may” it is WILL arise. 245 WILL suffer overbearing from a property which was refused and is now even bigger! 245 WILL suffer overshadowing with loss of light from a property refused, which is now even bigger!

Furthermore, whilst a garage has been removed in this proposal, this is an attempt for the developer to circumnavigate planning approval and then later submit plans for an extension/ garage for which they know might be refused at this stage. I appeal now for this to be refused at any point in the future.

A site visit observing current social distancing could have been conducted to observe this hideous development in all its disgusting glory and how the two built plots already have impacted the resident at 245. In our current state of national crisis I am appalled

this proposal is even being discussed as a non affordable home, which cannot and should not be built anytime soon. Where is the humanity in this situation, where is the doing the right thing here to protect our elderly and vulnerable, the resident at 245. This is just another attempt by a developer who is money rich and moral poor to manipulate again the planning policies at a time of crisis to push through plans which should never be approved.

One last footnote, the side elevations are incorrect and the block plan yet again still fails to show bin storage which is a requirement.

I appeal to you all to do the right thing. To refuse this development.