

# Comments for Planning Application DC/21/2255/DE1

## Application Summary

Application Number: DC/21/2255/DE1

Address: 27 Clements Lane Haverhill CB9 8JR

Proposal: Notification under Part 11 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 - Demolition of one dwelling

Case Officer: Ed Fosker

## Customer Details

Name: Mr Martin Espin

Address: 26 Clements Lane, Haverhill, Suffolk CB9 8JR

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other
- Parking issues
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: I am staggered that this application is being considered given the original application for the demolition of the property at 27 OLD CLEMENTS LANE was refused on 21 April 2021 on the basis of the property being a non-designated heritage asset.

I note that the original case officer is supporting this application from the notes given on the agents demolition application contrary to the comments received by him from the members on the planning development committee and the original application.

I note also that this application has not been circulated to residents of Old Clements Lane who it materially affects and that the demolition notice has been placed out of the way on a lamppost on Clements Lane rather than on the lane on which the property is actually sited. I therefore conclude that the notice is not served correctly and that those materially affected by the proposal have not had a proper opportunity to comment and raise objections.

I note also that the application states that no right of way is affected by the application which is patently incorrect as access to all residential properties on Old Clements Lane is via one single entry point at the booth of the lane joining the main highway (Clements Lane) therefore access to owners own properties will be restricted or prevented should this proposal be agreed. This is I believe constitutes a loss of residential amenity.

I would like to be informed why following the PDC refusal this application is being considered given nothing has changed other than the property has been sold to another developer who proposes to build a further three properties on the land. It would appear that by separating the demolition from the planning application it serves to confuse the issue and leave no consideration of the actual plans for the land.

I strongly object to this being allowed to happen and trust that sense will prevail and the application for demolition be rejected.

Martin Espin