[redacted]

From: DevelopmentControl
Sent: 19 December 2024 17:03
To: DevelopmentControl
Subject: Comments for Planning Application 24/02187/HHFUL

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 19/12/2024 5:02 PM from [redacted].

Application Summary

Address:	4 Sheep Street Leighton Bromswold Huntingdon PE28 5AY
Proposal:	Erection of rear/side single storey extension, insertion of roof lights, new entrance portico, replacement sash and casement windows and demolition of prefabricated single storey garage and construction of new single storey garage and timber gates to secondary access
Case Officer:	[redacted]

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	[redacted]
Email:	[redacted]
Address:	4 The Avenue[redacted]

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	While I am pleased that the property is to be renovated, I recommend refusal of the current planning proposals because they are unsympathetic to the existing property, the adjacent cluster of Listed Buildings including Grade 1 Listed parish church, and the wider Conservation Area. The proposed extension is too large and dominant, the design and materials are too modern and will detract from the historic surroundings. The large flat roof extension is not sympathetic to the property and will impact on views from the Listed parish church towards open countryside, Conservation Area and surrounding Grade 2 Listed buildings. It will also impact views from the adjacent PROW and Sheep Street as currently designed. A smaller extension which is clearly subservient and complementary to the main building is more likely to be acceptable if of a smaller scale, and with sloping or pitched roof to be in keeping with the

existing property.
The location of the proposed air source heat pump is not appropriate as it will be clearly visible from Sheep Street and the Listed building opposite, and will create noise nuisance.
The proposed roof windows are not appropriate and should be removed. They will impact on views from the PROW and on the attractive approach to the village and Conservation Area from the north.
The design and size of the garage is acceptable but the solar panels should be removed because of their visual impact on views of the church from Sheep Street and the PROW, and from the church towards open countryside and the Conservation Area.
Overall I feel the current proposals should be refused because of their impact on the adjacent Listed buildings and Conservation Area; because the design, appearance and materials are not appropriate for the historic setting; because of the impact on visual amenity; and because of noise and disturbance related to the proposed location of the air source heat pump.

Kind regards