Objection to Planning Application Ref: 25/00548/PIP

[redacted]

1. Ecological Impact and Habitat Loss

The proposed development necessitates the removal of a substantial section of mature hedgerow to achieve the required visibility splay for site access. This action would result in significant ecological harm, including the loss of established habitats for local wildlife.

2. Inconsistency with Previous Refusal

This application mirrors a prior proposal (Ref: 19/02574/PIP), which was refused due to "significant encroachment and intensification of residential development within the countryside, which would be at odds with the open and rural character of the area and the prevailing pattern of development nearby, causing adverse harm to the open and rural character of the surrounding area."

3. Impact on Residential Amenity

Since the previous refusal, permission has been granted for a two-and-a-half-storey dwelling (Ref: 23/01010/FUL) within one meter of the site boundary. This dwelling includes bedroom windows facing the proposed site. Approval of the current application would lead to mutual loss of privacy and an unacceptable level of overlooking, exacerbating concerns about overdevelopment and the erosion of the rural character.

4. Detriment to Local Amenity

The development would result in a complete loss of privacy, security, and residential amenity for properties along both Pond Close and Warboys Road. The proposal undermines the safety and comfort of current residents and compromises the character of the area. It is strongly considered that the openness of this land and its relationship with the countryside would be severely harmed by building on this land.

Conclusion

Though the application is made where 'titled balance' is to be taken into consideration, we strongly believe the reasons for refusal remain the same as those for the former application (Ref: 19/02574/PIP).

This proposal offers no discernible benefit to the local environment or community. It constitutes overdevelopment, poses serious ecological and amenity risks, and contradicts previous planning decisions. It would also result in the loss of Grade 2 agricultural land and set a troubling precedent for development on such land. It should also be acknowledged that there is no pedestrian path along the side of road where the site is, offering no connectivity to the village by foot and the village itself is limited with infrastructure and

would result in future occupiers to rely on sustainable transport methods to access facilities which is contrary to the principle of sustainable development.

We urge the Local Planning Authority to reject this application in its entirety.