DCAPLFC.
10/00799/FUL
- 1 JUN 2011

The Planning Inspectorate
EST 1909

3/13a Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol, BS1 6PN

Direct Line: 0117 372 8586
Customer Services: 0117 372 6372
Fax No: 0117 372 8181
e-mail: teamp12@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Mr Simon Wood
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council
Planning Officer
Council Offices
Argents Mead
Hinckley
Leicestershire
LE10 1BZ

Your Ref: 10/00799/FUL

Our Ref: APP/K2420/A/11/2150169/WF

Date: 31 May 2011

Dear Mr Wood

Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Appeal by Mr Christopher Harbot
Site at Rear Of 132 - 136 Main Street, Markfield, Coalville, LE67 9UX

I enclose third party correspondence relating to the above appeal.

If you have any comments on the points raised, please send 2 copies to me no later than **14 June 2011**. You should comment solely on the representations enclosed with this letter.

You cannot introduce new material or put forward arguments that should have been included in your earlier statement. If you do, your comments will not be accepted and will be returned to you.

Using e-mail and the internet

You can now use the internet to send us documents and check the information and the progress of this case at (www.planningportal.gov.uk/pcs). If you send us your comments by e-mail, you only need to send us one copy of each. However, if you post your comments, please send us 2 copies of everything and put the full appeal reference number on each copy.

Comments submitted after the deadline will not be seen by the Inspector unless there are extraordinary circumstances for the late submission.

Yours sincerely

Ceri-Marie Carr

INVESTOR IN PEOPLE
POSITIVE ABOUT DISABLED PEOPLE

The Planning Inspectorate

Further information on us and the planning appeal system can be found on our website www.planning-inspectorate.gov.uk

For official use only
(Date received)
9-May-2011 23:25

COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable for it. This can be found in the notification letter sent out by the local planning authority or the start date letter for it.

Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Case Reference: **APP/K2420/A/11/2150169**

Address of site: Rear of 132 - 136 Main Street
Markfield
Coalville
Leicestershire

Postcode: LE67 9UX Grid Reference: Easting: 4489382 Northing: 3102203

SENDER DETAILS

Name: Mr kristian bravin

Acting On Behalf Of: N/A

ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case? Interested Party / Person

What kind of representation are you making? Interested Party/Person Correspondence

YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

Please provide your representation below.

objections to the proposed property. i have previoulsy made objections althouhg am unable to find them.
My objections are numerous
1. The height of the building - claimed to be single storey but as there is going tobe a loft conversion this akes the loftroof height much taller and so he property will not be much smaller than a two storey house. this will therefore create a large shadow over my garden. the property at the end of my garden would also reduce the peace and quite of our garden as well as the possible increased pollution from vehicles from this house when sold.
2. The plot is very narrow, possibly too narrow for a house unless the border of the actual property nearly overhangs surrounding properties
3. There are a lot of large trees both in my garden and the millenium gardens nature reserve, some of which i believe have preservation orders, these will all overhang the property and i would imagine that future occupiers may request that these are cut down as they would block the light to their property which i would object to, i am also concenrned that the roots of many of

YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE (Continued)

these trees would be damaged when digging the foundations thus potentially killing these trees.
4. With all the buildings that are potentially going to be built in the village both near to this proposed house and across the village is there really a need for another 1, (2 at a squeeze) bedroom house shoe-horned into a tiny plot with insufficient space to turn a car.
5, The propsed windows on this property will also look into our neighbours house reducing their privacy both inthe house and in their garden
6. the disruption created on the buiding of this property could adversly affect the wildlife in both my garden, neighbours gardens and the public accessible millenium gardens

Carr, Ceri-Marie

From: Frank Brocklehurst [frank.brocklehurst1@btinternet.com]
Sent: 13 April 2011 10:57
To: Team P12
Subject: APPEAL REF: APP/K2420/A/!!/2150169/WF

Appeal REF: APP/K2420/A/11/2150169/WF Erection of a SINGLE STOREY DWELLING
Dear Sir/Madam, With reference to the above appeal, having now seen the Grounds for this appeal I wish to make the further comments/observations.
1)Although the notification of this appeal still states "Erection of a SINGLE STORY DWELLING" the grounds for this appeal now states "The proposed HOUSE". As this is
contrary to the original proposal may I suggest that this appeal actually now constitutes a NEW and DIFFERENT application and thus NOT an appeal of the original
proposal?.
2)The appeal states "The proposed HOUSE would represent a considerable improvement to the surrounding area. The current use of the site is a builders yard workshop
building to the rear of frontage properties on Main Street". Note. The said builders yard and workshop building is NOT obstrusive and never has been whereas a 22ft
SINGLE STORY DWELLING most certainly would affect other surrounding properties. Whilst it is of course appreciated that when property is purchased one does not
purchase the view, the view of any property CAN have affect on the purchase price and thus, depending on the situation, the view could enhance or detract the decision
of any prospective purchaser.
3)The appeal states "There are other examples of dwellings allowed and constructed on sites to the rear of frontage in Main Street. Specifically there is No.No.156 to the
rear of Nos. 158 and 152 ; PLUS No.186 to the rear of No.188". Note:
a)Although No.156 is much closer to Nos.158 and 152 and No.186 is much closer to No.188 than the proposed SINGLE STOREY DWELLING would be to any of the
surrounding properties, they nevertheless do not affect them.
b)Times change and although I am not familiar with the law/s in this respect, the houses quoted IE: Nos. 156 and 186 have been there at least 37 years when we came
to live here so is it possible that the laws have since changed and thus now prohibits building to be too close to other surrounding properties?
4)The appeal states " The proposal would not be to the detriment of the amenities and privacy of future occupiers and adjoining residents or properties authority wrongly
describes in part as Nos. 144 and 136 Main Street. This should surely read 136, 134 and 132 Main Street". NOTE.
Sorry but this is only the builders opinion. My opinion is YES, it would be detrimental to at least 5 other properties including 1 Park Road which surely should read
1 Park Ave?.
5)The appeal states "the proposed house has been designed so that the principal windows on the ground and FIRST FLOOR LEVEL all face South IE: away from any
other houses. It is understood that the occupiers of these houses did not object to the application and some expressed support and preference for the change of use
from the existing builder yard and workshop". Not sure what world this guy comes from but please note:
a)If a 22ft SINGLE STOREY DWELLING (one of now FIVE descriptions of the said proposal) has a FIRST FLOOR LEVEL, how does one describe a bungalow?.
b)Sorry but he understands wrong. Only ONE of the properties affected expressed support and welcomed the original proposal and even that occupier did NOT
make any mention of preferring a change of the builders yard and workshop. Furthermore TWO of the affected occupiers DID express STRONG objections.
6)The appeal states "Why should the planning authority presume to know better than the prospective occupiers what is acceptable to them. Note.
a)No more I guess than those who do not live on Main Street like to think they know that this proposal represents a considerable improvement to the character of the
Surrounding area.
b)Do we assume that the builder would not mind living in this proposed dwelling?.
Yours sincerely
Mr. F. Brocklehurst

This email was received from the INTERNET and scanned by the Government Secure Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Cable&Wireless Worldwide in partnership with MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) In case of problems, please call your organisation's IT Helpdesk.
Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

Carr, Ceri-Marie

From: Frank Brocklehurst [frank.brocklehurst1@btinternet.com]
Sent: 09 April 2011 11:59
To: Team P12
Subject: Comments on appeal
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Yellow

Reference : Appeal Ref : APP/K2420/A.11/2160169/WF Erection of a SINGLE STORY DWELLING
Dear Sir/Madam, I have to resort to sending this email as despite trying until I am blue in the face to use the sites given in your letter, I was not able too.
I refer to the reference I have given above. I wish to REITERATE my strong objection of this appeal as the proposal is NOT, I repeat NOT a SINGLE STOREY DWELLING and there is no way it can be accepted legally as a SINGLE STOREY DWELLING if there is going to be accommodation for a bedroom, shower and three storage area's.
Yours sincerely
Mr.F.Brocklehurst

This email was received from the INTERNET and scanned by the Government Secure Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Cable&Wireless Worldwide in partnership with MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) In case of problems, please call your organisation's IT Helpdesk.

Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

Carr, Ceri-Marie

From: Frank Brocklehurst [frank.brocklehurst1@btinternet.com]
Sent: 09 April 2011 15:25
To: Team P12
Subject: Appeal RE. Errection of a SINGLE STOREY DWELLING
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Yellow

Reference : APP/K2420/A/11/2150169/WF RE: Erection of a SINGLE STOREY DWELLING
Dear Sir/Madam, Please note the following corrections to me previous message
1)Appeal reference should read APP/K2420/A/11/2150169/WF
2)End of message should read "if there is going to be a PERMANENT staircase to a Bedroom and three storage area's upstairs IE: SECOND STOREY.
Yours sincerely
Mr.F.Brocklehurst

This email was received from the INTERNET and scanned by the Government Secure Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Cable&Wireless Worldwide in partnership with MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) In case of problems, please call your organisation's IT Helpdesk.

Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.