[redacted]

Subject: Objection to 25/00156/hhful 43 Senliz Road
Date: 16 February 2025 14:07:51

I object to the above planning application.
This is a residential property and not a business property. The applicant has cited livelihood and the risk of theft as a reason to retain the roller shutter however these are not material planning considerations.

I alerted the occupants of No. 45 to the works whilst they were on going and can confirm that I too asked them to cease on behalf of the occupants of No. 45.

The PD Rights for this property were removed as part of planning permission 18/02223/FUL in order to allow the planning authority to retain control of the wider development and to protect the appearance and character of the wider development.

Condition 9 of 18/02223/REM requires the parking spaces to be retained as parking spaces. It is therefore inappropriate of the applicant to suggest a condition could be set not to close off the back of the croft. The introduction of a wall would prevent the existing detached garage from being accessed for parking and would result in the loss of two parking spaces.

As stated by the occupants of No. 45 Senliz Road is a prominent and highly visible part of the Alconbury Weald development which has a Design Code that the developers are required to adhere to. This development is contrary to the Design Code and the retention of this shutter would set a dangerous precedent that could result in a harmful impact on the appearance and character of the wider development. I have no doubt this has already been noticed by local residents, given its prominence, and the longer this shutter remains the greater the likelihood of similar unauthorised developments popping up.

The applicants already have a set back and secure detached garage that would be suitable for parking vehicles including the van in.

The shutter bisects a parking space and results in the loss of a parking space and is therefore contrary to Key Phase 1 Design Code. On page 184 the Design Code states on plot parking between dwellings must be set behind the building line with spaces being designed so as to not allow for tandem parking projecting forward of the building line which is clearly a design to prevent cars becoming dominant features in the residential street scene.

The shutter bisects a tandem parking space so when the shutter is down vehicles would by necessity be parked forward of the building line making them more visible and dominant in the street scene. No. 43's driveway is close to the main access from Senliz Road which makes it difficult for vehicles turning in from Senliz Road.

The applicants plot is Plot 105 on planning layout plan ref 003 E in planning permission 18/02223/REM and this clearly shows that as a result of the development the shutter would bisect a parking space.

The installation of the shutter is contrary to Key Phase 1 Design Code for front access drive throughs The shutter encloses the undercroft and is at odds with the wider street scene, creating an unattractive and out of character feature in an otherwise well designed street scene. The deployment of the shutter has a harmful impact on the street scene also because it creates a flat facade which is at odds with the street scene for set back garages and views through under the crofts.

Conclusion:
The development is contrary to restrictive covenants that are not overridden by planning.

The development is contrary to the NPPF paragraph 134 and 135 and LP 14 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan (HLP) as it is out of keeping with the street scene and has resulted in a harmful impact on the amenity of No.45 both visually and from a noise impact. The development is contrary to the Design Code for Key Phase 1 of the Alconbury Weald development which requires on plot parking not to project forward of the building line and

because it has resulted in the loss of parking which is contrary to Condition 9 of 18/02223/REM.

Regards

[redacted]

2 Glebe Lane
Buckden
PE195TG