

**From:** Heather Dalby [mailto:]  
**Sent:** 07 June 2021 17:05  
**To:** development.control@charnwood.gov.uk  
**Subject:** Planning application - P/21/0816/2

I am objecting to planning application - P/21/0816/2 - Erection of a 2.5 storey extension to care home on 38 Mountsorrel Lane, Sileby.

I am objecting for the following reasons -

1. This extension would fall within the Conservation area for the village, as identified in the Charnwood Borough Council website. It is very large at 2.5 storey high and would be very visible from the entrance to the village along Mountsorrel Lane due to the prominent position of Highbury on the hill.
2. The extension is not in keeping with the old style of the house and as this is a U shape will be seen directly against the original house, again this detracts from the Conservation status and design of the older property and this area.
3. The extension is over proportionate to the size and elevation of land available. Even if it is positioned into the lay of the hillside it will significantly overshadow neighboring properties. The application states that the extension has taken into account and been done sympathetically to neighboring properties. We do not feel this is the case and there has been no regard or consultation with neighboring properties.

The application states that the current application's footprint is nearly identical to that of the single storey five bedroomed extension which was conditionally approved in 2014. This proposal was 5 bedrooms in a row and not the u shape of the new proposal. The footprint could be deemed to be similar but the 2.5 story is in now way comparable to the previous application.

4. The extension will provide a significant lack of privacy for neighboring properties. The proposed extension has 20 windows in it. These will overlook the neighbouring properties and due to the height of the extension they will look directly into properties gardens and windows on three sides. As this extension is a Care home there would be multiple residents and staff members looking out of the extension windows into neighboring properties. We feel this is more significant in terms of infringements into privacy compared to a residential property with family occupants.
5. There would be a loss of light into our garden due to the size and proximity of the proposed extension.
6. There will be disturbance to neighboring properties in terms of interior and external lights and noise from residents, call alarms etc. The top of the extension has been designated for office / storage space. This would presumably mean that they would be used at night-time while residents are asleep as is the situation with the current office/ staff space. Therefore, shining lights onto neighboring properties. The residential home already has a security light on the side which is on all night. This is only made acceptable for neighbours due to the large fir trees in situ.

7. The issues with privacy and disturbance will be significantly greater in the autumn and winter when the trees have shed their leaves. The trees which may partly screen the proposed site are deciduous.

8. The traffic and parking on Mountsorrel Lane is very difficult to navigate. There are traffic calming measures directly outside of the Residential home which have been put there due to difficulties with volume and speed of traffic. It is hard to see how the extension of 10 additional bedrooms will not increase traffic directly to the site, whether this would be families, visitors, ambulances, health and social care professionals and more care staff or vehicles making deliveries, unloading and exiting the property. The summary of the application states that the development is for extra rooms and ensuite bedrooms for more residents.

There is no provision for additional parking on site at the residential home which is already at capacity for parking as you will see when walking by the entrance to the home. This would cause again significant difficulties to an already congested route.

9. This grass land which has been identified for development is valuable soak away land for rain and due to the sloping site and location near the flood plain we are concerned that this will run off the building into the gardens which sit lower than the Highbury site. The developers have identified in their information that there may be a flooding risk to neighbouring properties and that they would try to use permeable external finishes *where possible* to manage the risk. This does not seem an adequate proposal.

10. The current grassed area is a habitat for [REDACTED] and other fauna and flora. This is due to there being a pond near the site prior to the development of Herrick Close and the proximity to the flood plain. [REDACTED] are a protected species under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. I feel the loss of this natural habitat would be detrimental to the local eco system.

Yours sincerely

Heather Dalby

38 Herrick Close