

Development Control Committee 1st June 2017

Committee Update Report

Item 6 - DC/17/0354/HH - 5 West Road, Bury St Edmunds, IP33 3EL

Further representations made

- Page 11 Following the end of the re-consultation period, additional objections have been received from No.11 West Road and two other residents. These are summarised below:
 - All of the objections I previously raised to this planning application still stand. The new plans have been submitted with an increase of 3mm at one end of the now restricted shared access and 10cm at the other. This still means that the enjoyment I have experienced from my property and garden over many years will be severely restricted from that currently appreciated.
 - Over the years this has included but is not limited to:
 - i. Moving my beehives between sites, including the one in my garden. These are either carried by 2 people as they are exceptionally heavy and awkward or put in a wheelbarrow. However, they don't always sit square in a wheelbarrow so someone is needed at the side to steady the hive to ensure it doesn't tip out.
 - ii. Moving wheelie bins back and forth with ease.
 - iii. Wheel barrowing garden waste
 - iv. Taking bicycles through
 - We should be able to undertake all of these activities safely and without risk of accident or injury.
 - I will reiterate a solid 2m high gate and fence at the front is unacceptable as the resident at number 5 has a dog which he has told me will bite if he is not around. We need to see if the dog is loose before attempting to enter the access.
 - Despite the application form saying the extension will not be visible from the road, it is substantially higher than the 2m fence that has been requested so

- will be seen.
- I object to the revised plans.
- An increase of 4" from 29.5 inches (750mm) to 33.5 inches (850mm) for access is still too restrictive. The measurements are still dependent on a questionable boundary between 5 West Road and the house in York Road.
- I would also like to draw to your attention the other objections. In particular the proposed installation of the fence and gate across the shared access at the front of Ladysmith cottages.
- The installation of this fence creates a personal safety issue for any owner/occupier, or persons that have been given license, by the owners/occupiers, whilst using the shared access.
- The 10cm (4") increase in the width of the remaining path on the revised plans is inadequate for our needs and is inconsequential. It, theoretically, takes the remaining access to 850mm (or 33 ½") which is still far narrower than the width enjoyed by these properties for the last 100 years.
- Our objections to the first set of plans have not been addressed in the second set of plans therefore our objections remain.