

Pine Tree Cottage
62 Martins Road
Keevil
Wiltshire
BA14 6NA

Development Services
Wiltshire Council

30th August 2018

Dear James Taylor

Application No: 18/07717/FUL

I would like to object to the above planning application at 63-65 Martins Road Keevil.

The site is the garden belonging to 63-65 Martins road and as such it falls within the curtilage of both a listed building and the conservation area.

The following quote has been taken from the Wiltshire Council website information on Conservation areas. “ Most of Wiltshire’s conservation areas are made up of historic parts of towns and villages. Most Conservation areas have a high concentration of historic buildings, many of which are listed. The character of a conservation area is not defined by these buildings alone, the setting, location, features and **open spaces** also have a large part to play. The designation of a conservation area requires that the planning authority should pay special attention to preserving and enhancing the character and appearance of the conservation area.”

With reference to the Design and Access Statement, my objections are as follows

1.1

The 'Land at Martins Road' is the garden of 63-65 Martins Road which is a 17th Century thatched listed property within the conservation area.

1.7

I cannot find any reference to 'Phase 1 works' in the plans submitted or planning permission granted in July 2016 ? Were Wiltshire Council aware of a Phase 1 and Phase 2 plan for this development at 63-65 Martins Road?

The site cannot be described as 'disused ' as it is a garden comprising of trees, grass and hedgerow. The developer chooses to call it disused for the purpose of this application.

This would be over development of a site that is too small considering the consent and access already given for at least 6 cars.

1.8

The site is the existing rear garden of a grade 2 listed property and it is the developer that chooses to call it a residual rear garden.

The southern boundary hedge of 63-65 marks the line of the conservation area and infill developments such as Olcote have been built appropriately outside of the conservation area. The residential property to the north of the site is Pine Tree Cottage, 62 Martins Rd which is a grade 2 listed property also within the conservation area.

1.19

I disagree – within the part of Martins Road that is covered by the conservation area – the development is mostly historic listed properties.

2.1

Paragraph 132 of the NPPF states that “ significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or **development within its setting**”

2.5

This development would not make the most of the limited unused land available within Keevil. As the site is a garden should be retained as valuable outside green space or allotments for the properties 63-65 Martins Road. If the developer removed the brand new high fence that he has erected across the width of the garden he could easily incorporate the whole garden for the enjoyment of the existing listed property. It is only 'unused land' in the opinion of the developer.

2.7

This development would lead to substantial harm of a heritage asset and there would be no public benefit of the proposal. Therefore planning permission should be refused. Its optimum viable use is to remain as a garden or green open space within the conservation area.

The existing property has already been divided into 3 cottages requiring 6 tandem parking spaces at the rear of the property. If a 3 bedroom house is built this will need additional parking provision, plus turning and access space. Any further development will see this heritage area become a small cul de sac which will be harmful to the conservation area. More importantly, if this garden is built on it will set a precedent for the whole conservation area in Keevil and any residents with large gardens in the village will be watching this decision with interest.

2.8

This proposal does not preserve the positive elements of the setting as the existing garden setting will be lost.

2.9

I cannot find a reference to Phase 1 in the planning granted for the conversion of 63-65 Martins road? As such this means that the garden remains within the curtilage of 63-65 Martins Road and the design does not embed the proposed dwelling into the village setting. The height of the proposed property will be the same as Pine Tree Cottage which will have a major impact on the overall character of the setting.

2.13

Infill described as a small gap within the village should be kept in context in this case.

2.16

The proposed development in this position/locality cannot be described as complementary and enhancing local distinctiveness to the value of the natural and historic environment relating to the landscape setting and existing pattern of development.

This is overdevelopment in a restricted space.

The building will not integrate into this setting as the layout is too large, the roofline will be too high and the parking requirements will be too large.

2.18

The land remains in the curtilage of 63-65 Martins Road. Not situated within the 'former' curtilage. Why should this be classed as redundant and without use and no longer part of the green infrastructure? This development will not be sympathetic towards the listed building's character as it will be a modern building within the conservation area. It will destroy existing green space within the curtilage of a listed building that could be left to enhance what has already been developed. The current views into and within the garden site will be lost and certainly not enhanced by this development.

2.20

The proposed site diminishes the buildings setting at the convenience of the developer for this application alone. The developer has made a choice to put a large fence across the garden width and not invest any time or care on the garden.

2.21

The parking provision is based on minimum parking standards which will create issues in this sometimes busy area of the village. The village hall situated on Martins Road is a well used village facility and Martins Road residents already struggle to park or gain access to their properties on occasions when the hall is in use. The minimum parking for 63-65 is already poorly thought out and will result in the new owners parking along Martins Road. In my opinion the tandem parking plan at the rear of 63-65 does not allow for turning space and ease of access for 6 cars. Add to this a further development and potential 2-3 more vehicles in an already restricted area. The potential development will resemble a cul de sac on a new housing estate.

2.27

This garden is an important open space, which is part of the historical development pattern and as such it should be kept as unchanged as possible to maintain the character and essential form of the village.

2.30

The development would affect the curtilage of the surrounding listed buildings and change the setting that they are currently in. There would be a negative impact on the character of the conservation area. There is no argument to support this development just because it is on the edge of the conservation area, as any development within the conservation area should be restricted.

4.4

A two storey three bedroom unit with double garage is too big for this site.

4.7

There is not enough space for 2 cars to park plus turning and access. Also access would be restricted for delivery vehicles and the rubbish /recycling collection lorry.

4.11

The roof ridge height is too high. **At only 20cm lower than the roof of 63-65 Martins Rd** the new development would tower over the adjacent bungalow Olcote and is far too high for this garden setting from the view of 62, 63 -65 Martins Road. The proposed roof ridge height would be the same as Pine Tree Cottage 62 Martins Road.

4.17

The majority of the mature trees around the edge of the site belong to Pine Tree Cottage 62 Martins Road. Any proposed development in such a restricted area may cause damage to the roots of these large trees along the north boundary.

5.8

The design will adversely impact the amenity of the surrounding properties and enjoyment of gardens as it is obtrusive over development of a garden in a village setting.

5.11

This does not represent sustainable development, as it will cause depletion of the natural resources and environment in this conservation area garden and therefore it should not be approved.

In summary.

I cannot find any reference to phase 1 and phase 2 on the 2016 planning application and planning granted on 63-65 Martins Road. The reference to Phase 1 and Phase 2 is rather misleading and I feel that this is a term that the developer has used for his own advantage.

The large fence and 5 bar gate that the developer has erected this summer across the width of the garden is not shown on the 2015 site plan drawing number C8584.15.050 on which planning permission was granted in 2016. However, I believe that the developer has recently erected this fence and gate for the purpose of this application.

The over development of this site will create an extra requirement for on street parking in Martins Road which will affect highway safety and traffic.

The roof ridge height will be the same as Pine Tree Cottage and is too high.

The development is too big for the garden site and will set a precedent and encourage future planning applications within the conservation area.

Yours Sincerely

Mr David Sheridan

