

The original plans were misaligned with the lane and they were so inaccurate that the four plots could not possibly fit into the site without rearranging them.

If built strictly to the approved plan the plots would in fact be some 5m northwest of their current positions.

The plans did not show the neighbouring properties accurately. The position of Deepdene is at least 3m closer than was shown on the plans. So the impact on neighbouring property **was significantly misjudged** from the start. Such that it incorporates the rear of Deepdene into a high density mini exec housing estate.

It was declared unlawful last October.

The key question is “ Do the new plans make this development more harmful than was **ever intended** by the Committee when it approved the original plans?” The answer is **undeniably “YES”**.

These buildings are **closer, ...more overbearing ...and overshadowing** to neighbouring properties than was intended by the original committee decision.

The Report focuses on minimum separation distances.

(next slide please)

Your design guidance says

“... the setback from the side boundary should be suited to the position and size of building....

*...Large houses with minimum set back **should be avoided***

*commonly accepted standards (ie 11 m back to back) may be used as a point of reference. But should not be ,,,,,,,applied **mindlessly**.”*

(next slide)

If you look at Plot 3 it is a huge house. It does not have a traditional rear and side. There are a total of 10 windows from which you can look at an angle of 45 degrees towards Deepdene and it's immediate rear garden.

At its closest this building is **just over 8 m** from it's boundary with Deepdene , 10m at the most. This does not even meet the set-back standard for the rear of a small two bedroom home.

Furthermore this plot's ground floor is 3m higher. So as a point of reference , the separation distances for the equivalent of a 3 storey home would be 27m. There is not 27m between these two properties

The height of the eaves have also have been increased by half a metre adding to the overall bulk of the building

This unlawful development is **without doubt** more harmful than **ever intended** by the original committee decision

We recommend you refuse this retrospective application.

(Next slide)

Finally, we agree with condition 10 that the bedroom 3 window **must** be obscure glazed to protect privacy. But it is quite extraordinary to be recommending the building of an additional ensuite, which will remove the only other window in this bedroom.

In summary, this is a harmful development which should never have been built outside of its permissions and we ask you to refuse it

Thank you