[redacted]

**From:** DevelopmentControl
**Sent:** 04 March 2025 10:27
**To:** DevelopmentControl
**Subject:** Comments for Planning Application 25/00204/HHFUL

# Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 04/03/2025 10:26 AM from [redacted]

## Application Summary

| | |
|---|---|
| Address: | 22 Scotts Crescent Hilton Huntingdon PE28 9PG |
| Proposal: | Erection of a rear extension |
| Case Officer: | Josh France |

Click for further information

## Customer Details

| | |
|---|---|
| Name: | [redacted] |
| Email: | [redacted] |
| Address: | 20 Scotts Close Hilton Huntingdon |

## Comments Details

| | |
|---|---|
| Commenter Type: | Member of the Public |
| Stance: | Customer objects to the Planning Application |
| Reasons for comment: | |
| Comments: | We refer to Planning Application Ref: 25/00204/HHFUL<br><br>We have now had the opportunity of reviewing the plans and documents available on HDC website, unfortunately there are numerous errors within the documents which we feel distorts the impression of the property and the application itself. Our comments are as follows:<br><br>Householder Application Form:<br>- The address of Bright Architectural Services is not populated on the form, as the form requests.<br>- Trees and Hedges - it is stated that there are no trees on the property or adjoining within felling distance. This is factually incorrect as there is a substantial Silver Birch within the rear garden of the subject property, No. 22 Scotts Crescent, which is circa 16m from the existing rear wall, and therefore circa 12m from the rear wall should the extension be approved/completed.<br>- Hedging is considerably closer circa 5m.<br>- It is stated that the certificate of ownership is completed by the applicant, [redacted] |

however, we understand that she is not the owner; unless the property is owned by a third party and not the present occupiers.

Biodiversity Checklist:
- The question as to whether there is a pond within 250m has been incorrectly answered as a simple check on Google Earth indicates that the proposed extension is within:
a) 140m of a large pond within the High Street (Reeves Ditch).
b) 120m of a pond at the junction of High Street, Potton Road and Graveley Way
c) 180m of a pond within Graveley Way (The Ware).
All of the above are significant water courses within the village.

Design Access Statement (revision A 07/02/2025):
- Within Section 5, there is reference to 'The Cottage', this we can only assume is actually Cob Cottage and is incorrectly named within the statement.
- The Cottage (Cob Cottage) is stated to be behind No. 22 but is actually directly adjacent, and slightly in front, of No. 22.
- Cooke's Cottage is stated to be concealed behind the fence and garage of No. 22, this again is totally incorrect as the garage to No. 22 is to the South West of the proposed development and Cooke's Cottage is to the South East.
- Section 7 states there will be matching of the existing window styles. However, this does not accord with the plans as only the proposed South West facing elevation kitchen door and adjacent small window seem to match the "Neo Georgian" design of the original structure. The proposed window to the Eastern elevation seems to be totally out of character, as are the glazed doors and gable end panel to the South elevation.
- It is also stated that the high gable end window of Cooke's Cottage is circa 20m from the proposed development. However, upon checking, this is incorrect at it is approximately 17m when measured on Google Earth.
- We are surprised that there is no reference within the document to matching to designs of the original Campbell Buchanan Development, of which No. 22 forms.

The Public Access Plans:
- The total footprint of the existing house, measured externally, from Google Earth, is circa 87m2. The footprint of the property will be increased to 107m2

For a planning application it is essential that the information provided, by the applicants and/or their representatives, in this case to Huntingdonshire District Council, be accurate. This is to allow readers, whether they be council town planners, local council members or members of the public, to be provided with a true representation of the situation without the need for them to visit the site in person and check details. Thus, enabling them to make a decision based on accurate detailed information.

Taking the above into account we feel that the application has not provided a correct representation of the facts and seems to have been completed in a shoddy manner which also may result in it receiving less scrutiny. The application should therefore be rejected on this alone at this stage.

In addition to the above, we feel that our own situation has not been taken into account in this application. We are the owners/occupiers of No. 20 Scotts Close, this being the property directly to the rear of the subject. Our property seems to be the most affected by the application, as it looks directly towards the proposed rear extension of No. 22 Scotts Crescent.

Taking the proposed plans into account the development will have a considerable visual impact on us, bringing the rear elevation of No. 22 Scotts Crescent significantly closer to our property. In addition, the rear gable end design, which will be clearly visible, is totally out of character with the neo-Georgian design of both the subject property, as well as the other houses constructed at the same time by Campbell Buchanan, which all share a design template.

The extent of glazing in the proposed structure, including the rear glazed gable end, will increase the light pollution from the property which may have an adverse effect on wildlife, including bat activity which we currently regularly observe at dusk.

We therefore feel that this application should be rejected.

Kind regards