

I am writing to lodge my support for the addendum to the planning report published on your portal on the 17 September and to object to the response from the applicant published on the portal on 23rd September, one day before the planning meeting, despite the date on the document showing 1 September. This has afforded little opportunity for objectors to counter the submission made by the applicant. However I would respond to the points made as follows.

1. Local Landscape Policy Area (LLPA) Impact: The applicant's argument misinterprets Policy ENV1 and PTL 06.
 - Comparable footprint and height requirement: The supporting text to PTL 06 is explicit — "no further development is appropriate other than the replacement of existing buildings of comparable footprint and height." This is a key safeguard in LLPAs, ensuring new development respects the existing scale and avoids incremental overdevelopment. The proposed dwelling is not comparable in footprint or height, as confirmed by the Planning Officer Report (paras 1.5–1.7). This is a material policy conflict.
 - Dominance in the LLPA: ENV1 does not prohibit development, but it requires that new development should not "dominate areas of distinctive landscape and townscape character." The proposed long frontage and substantial two-storey massing onto the cliff path clearly dominate the coastal character, unlike the low-lying bungalow currently on site. The developer's suggestion that Rock Drive or Strand Road set the context is misplaced: those properties are outside the Dominican Walk LLPA and cannot be used as a precedent within this protected designation. The relevant context is the immediate cluster of modest dwellings abutting the cliff path, not elevated or more distant development.
 - Quality and character impact: The proposal brings the building further forward and increases its bulk, materially altering views from the public right of way and eroding the distinctive open coastal character identified in the LLPA designation. This is a clear adverse effect on the features ENV1 seeks to protect.
2. Residential Amenity of No. 38 Strand Road: The developer's claims underestimate the impact.
 - Bulk and massing: Even if the ridge is only marginally higher than No. 38, the overall scale, width, and forward positioning create an oppressive and overbearing relationship. Ridge height alone does not capture the increased massing, which the Officer Report correctly identifies as unacceptable.
 - Proximity: A gable-to-gable distance of 7 m is only acceptable where the relative scale and height are comparable. In this case, the two-storey bulk, combined with the forward projection toward No. 38, produces an overbearing effect not typical in this LLPA.
 - Outlook and overshadowing: The developer suggests "negligible" impact on sunlight. However, overshadowing is not only about direct sunlight but also the sense of enclosure, reduced sky visibility, and loss of outlook. The increased height and bulk to the south will materially reduce the amenity of No. 38.
 - Privacy: Even a single first-floor gable window risks overlooking. The need to propose obscure glazing itself highlights the unsuitability of the design in such proximity.

In summary, the revised proposal continues to conflict with both ENV1 and PTL 06, as well as PPS 7 in relation to residential amenity. The development:

- Is not of comparable footprint and height to the existing

dwelling. • Will dominate the LLPA and harm its distinctive coastal character. • Will have an overbearing and overshadowing impact on No. 38 Strand Road. For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Planning Committee to uphold the recommendation of refusal. Amanda McLean