

drinkstoneclerk@gmail.com

From: Janet Elnaugh <drinkstone.elnaughj@gmail.com>
Sent: 30 May 2025 13:18
To: Drinkstone Clerk; Paul Selvey
Subject: Fwd: Yew tree planning

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Peter Holborn** <drinkstoneholborn@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2022 at 22:11
Subject: Re: Yew tree planning
To: Janet Elnaugh <drinkstone.elnaughj@gmail.com>
Cc: Christine Emery <drinkstone.emeryc@gmail.com>, Drinkstone Clerk <drinkstoneclerk@gmail.com>, Emily Elnaugh <drinkstone.elnaughe@gmail.com>, Paul Selvey <drinkstoneselveyp@gmail.com>, Richard Edmondson <DrinkstoneEdmondsonR@gmail.com>, Tim Moss <drinkstonemosst@gmail.com>

Hi Janet,

Yes the settlement boundary should have been updated when we prepared the NP to reflect the outline permission that had previously been granted. By the time we realised this the public consultation phase had been completed and we were advised that we couldnt alter the settlement boundary in the draft NP without starting the consultation process again.

My only further comment on the amended application concerns the rather twee low wall proposed within the visibility splay. If the PC resolves not to object to the application then I suggest we request that the submission, approval and implementation of landscaping scheme is made a condition of the development to include a new mixed hedge at the back of the visibility splay to be in keeping with the character of the hedge on the opposite side of Cross Street. One of the NP's supporting documents is The AECOM Design Guidelines and para 3.2.5 covers Building Line and Boundary treatment. "Boundary treatments should reinforce the sense of continuity of the building line and help define the street appropriate to the rural character of the area. They should be mainly continuous hedges with a minority of low walls made of flint with red brick cap on top or lined with bricks standing perpendicular to the wall." Given the rural character of the hedge and field opposite I consider a native mixed hedge to be the appropriate boundary treatment.

Regards

Peter

On Tuesday, February 15, 2022, Janet Elnaugh <drinkstone.elnaughj@gmail.com> wrote:
Hi All

It appears Yew Tree application has come through as an amendment as opposed to a new application which was stated as our preferred approach at the last meeting.

With regards to residents comments and the settlement boundary I need to get the facts completely clear (I think this revolves around the development of the NP). Am I right in thinking the NP settlement boundary should have been changed to meet the 'new' MSDC boundary when the NP was being developed (as the plot was within the allotted sites for development) and was missed at the last stage or has the situation changed? I know we have asked the maps to be overlayed to ensure there are no other differences and I know this subject has been debated before but I just want to be crystal clear.

Thank you all

Janet