

Representation from Occupiers of 4a Tinhead Road

We write in relation to the above application. We acknowledge that, as proposed, the scheme includes a strip of land which provides a buffer between our property and the adjoining new public space, and we welcome this approach. However, while this buffer is shown on the submitted plans, its purpose and role in protecting residential amenity are not articulated within the supporting Planning Statement. We therefore wish to provide some additional context to assist in the consideration of the application.

1. Residential Amenity and Proximity of Public Open Space

Our property is unusually positioned in that it would be closely bounded on multiple sides by publicly accessible open space. While we accept the recreational use proposed as part of the overall scheme, this relationship is materially different from that experienced by other nearby dwellings.

We therefore request that due regard is given to the living conditions at our property, particularly in respect of outlook, sense of enclosure and general residential amenity, consistent with the objectives of Core Policy 57.

2. Western Boundary Treatment and Level Differences

We would draw attention to the western boundary, where there is a noticeable change in ground level between our rear garden and the adjoining field. This distinguishes our property from No. 4 Tinhead Road and means that standard boundary treatments could have a disproportionately visual and enclosing effect when viewed from our garden and rear windows.

To assist in understanding this, we have provided a photo montage which shows:

- the existing rear garden and level differences;
- a before and after comparison using an improvised 2-metre-high panel as a proxy for fencing; and
- the impact on a high-level rear window, which would be affected by any solid boundary treatment.

We consider the inclusion of the strip of land between our property and the proposed public open space to be essential to the protection of the residential amenity of Nos. 4 and 4A Tinhead Road. This element of the proposal provides a necessary physical and visual buffer between private residential accommodation and publicly accessible recreational land.

While this strip is shown consistently on the submitted plans, it is not meaningfully addressed within the supporting Planning Statement, nor is its role in safeguarding residential amenity clearly articulated. In our view, this buffer is a critical component of the scheme and should be recognised as such.

The Planning Statement indicates that a post-and-rail fence is proposed along the boundary. While this form of boundary treatment may be appropriate in the existing rural context, the material difference introduced by the proposal is that the adjoining land would become publicly accessible. This would allow members of the public to stand within the park and be afforded direct views towards the rear of our property, including ground-floor rear bedrooms and the kitchen/dining area.

Given that our property already has established public views to the front, the retention of privacy to the rear is fundamental to maintaining acceptable living conditions. Without the buffer provided by the strip of land, and without careful consideration of boundary treatment, the proposal would result in a clear erosion of residential privacy and amenity.

We therefore consider that the strip of land, together with appropriate boundary treatment, is integral to ensuring compliance with Core Policy 57, and we respectfully request that its role in protecting residential amenity is clearly acknowledged and secured as part of the development.

Other residential amenity issues

The mentions of amenity in The Pegasus Planning document submitted in support of the application, focus on visual amenity and are not framed in the usual planning sense of safeguarding neighbouring residential amenity (e.g. noise, overlooking, loss of privacy, disturbance) under CP57.

It is recognised that some matters relating to activity and operation will also be addressed through the licensing regime. However, from a planning perspective, where proposals involve the extension and intensification of the pub and farm shop, bringing activity closer to neighbouring residential properties, it would ordinarily be expected that the layout, boundary treatment, lighting strategy and proposed planting are clearly explained as part of the scheme's approach to mitigating potential impacts on residential amenity.