27 Warrington Drive

Leek

ST13 8NA

14 October 2016

Application SMD/2016/0574

Application Name: David Stevenson, 29 Warrington Drive, Leek
Proposed single storey extension to side and rear (resubmission of SMD/2015/0481)

Dear Mrs. Critchlow,

Further to our telephone conversation we are writing once again to contest the above Planning Application on the following grounds:-

1. On looking at the plans we can see no Architect's name, site measurements or dimensions leading us to question the legality of the plans. This makes it particularly worrying for us as to how close the proposed extension would be to our property (No. 27) and without accurate measurements it is difficult to contemplate and also bearing in mind the narrowness of the two driveways separating Nos.27 and 29.

2. Lack of light and privacy. Looking from our side of the boundary towards the proposed extension we will be faced with a brick wall which will cause us loss of light to our kitchen and hall.

3. Length of time it will take to complete the work as there will be no building company assigned to the project and Mr. Stevenson will be doing most of the work himself after work and in his spare time. Bearing in mind that Mr. Stevenson has 3 young children and is out at work from 7am until 4.30pm each day it will leave little time for him to do building work especially as winter approaches. He is also away sometimes at the weekends and spends time with his children and girlfriend so from a practical point of view an extension of this kind which should take approximately six months to complete could go on for years. As a matter of fact Mr. Stevenson built a patio to the rear of his property which was unfinished for almost a year and was only completed days before submitting his first Planning Application. Likewise there is what one presumes to be a gazebo at the rear of his garden which after months is still waiting to be finished. Also incidentally at the beginning of September scaffolding was erected at the property to enable Mr. Stevenson to replace the facia boards but not surprisingly six weeks later the scaffolding is still there and this work is not completed either.

4. Also it should be taken into account the amount of noise, dirt, pollution, potential hazards and inconvenience to ourselves if the work took such a long time to complete. Therefore for the above reasons we would like to know if there is an expiry date on the application for when the works, if approved, would have to be completed.

5. Parking. There are problems with neighbourhood parking since as many as four cars and a van can be parked at No. 29. This is a considerable nuisance to neighbouring properties even though Mr. Stevenson has ticked the box "no" in his application to say that it will not affect parking in the area.

On looking at the refusal of Planning Permission SMD 2015/0481 dated 11.01.2016 it was refused for the following reasons and specifically states:-

1. The proposed side extension would create an unacceptable confined space between the property and its neighbour resulting in an overbearing impact upon the amenity of residents in the adjoining property.

2. Clarity and confirmation to be had in the plans.

3. Loss of light and privacy No. 27.

4. Likely duration of the work and therefore extended period of nuisance.

5. Likely time of day for the work to take place.

6. Lack of parking.

7. The driveways between the properties No. 27 and No. 29 are narrow.

8. The extension would leave approximately 0.8m wide pathway along the property boundary.

9. Due to the narrowness of the separation of the two properties it is considered that the extension would result in an overbearing addition alongside No. 27.

10. Fundamental concern about the impact on the amenity on the occupiers of No.27

I am sure that you will agree that in Mr. Stevenson's latest Planning Application he has not addressed any of the above issues but most importantly has not addressed "the unacceptable confined space between the property and its neighbour resulting in an overbearing impact upon the residents of the adjoining No. 27", the "narrowness of the two driveways" and the "likely duration of the work and extended period of nuisance". This is therefore the reason why we both strongly object to this new Application and trust that you will consider favourably our above concerns before deciding on the outcome.

We look forward to hearing from you as soon as possible.

Mr. G. and Mrs. L. Graham