

DC Admin

From:
Sent: 29 August 2026 06:51
To: DC Admin;
Cc: Cllr Anthony Smith
Subject: Final Comment: Revised plans 2 - Planning application 2026/91900

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear James,

I am submitting a final comment because revised plans were uploaded on the last day of consultation and they materially change the depiction of the access, steps, and boundary. These changes require clarification and do not reflect the physical reality on site.

1. Steps and landing area

The newly drawn steps do not match the existing steps on site.
The current steps are straight, uneven, and partially obstructed by a large pipe.

The revised plan shows one step at a right angle, which does not exist and does not reflect the real geometry.

The landing at the top of the steps remains extremely limited and is already below safe access standards.

2. Gate position and swing

The gate is not shown on the revised plan.

In reality, the gate swings towards the steps and already strikes the boundary fence.

Any reduction in usable space would place the gate arc inside the proposed wall position, creating a collision hazard and further restricting access.

3. Usable width and the “90 cm gap”

Although the new plan shows a 90 cm gap between the proposed wall and the boundary line, the actual usable width remains significantly less due to:

the existing recess,

the obstructing pipe,

the gate swing,

the narrow landing,

and the drop into my garden.

The physical width at the landing is approximately 30–45 cm and cannot be increased by redrawing the steps.

The revised plan does not represent the real constraints on site.

4. Pipe obstruction

The large pipe on the opposite side of the access continues to obstruct the walking line and reduce usable width.

5. Practical access requirements

I rely on regular professional maintenance of my garden and hedges, as I cannot safely carry out this work myself.

Gardeners must bring equipment (including a lawnmower), and window cleaners also require access to the rear of the property.

The current access is already difficult for them to navigate, and the proposed extension would make safe access significantly harder.

This is a practical amenity impact that should be considered.

6. Flooding, light, and noise impacts

The revised plans do not address:

existing flooding issues in my garden,

the loss of light caused by the proposed extension,

or the ongoing noise impact from the neighbouring property.

These issues remain unchanged and would be worsened by the proposed development.

7. Accuracy of plans

The revised drawings still omit:

the recess depth,

the pipe,

the gate arc,

the drop into my garden,

and the true step geometry.

These omissions mean the plans do not accurately represent the site and do not allow a safe assessment of access or amenity impact.

For these reasons, I request that the revised plans be fully considered and that this supplementary comment be accepted as part of the assessment.

It is also worth noting that the extractor fan has remained in the same place which would be another issue when turning such a narrow gap.

Many thanks,