15th February, 2017,

The Planning Department,
Staffordshire Moorlands District Council,
Moorlands House,
Leek,
Staffordshire.
ST13 6HQ.

Dear Sir or Madam,

Re: Planning Applications – SMD/2017/0046 and SMD/2017/0033 – Change of use of Offices: Court Lodge, Leonard St Leek, ST13 5JP.

We are the owners of 17 Shoobridge St., Leek ST1 3 5LA, which property sits directly behind the proposed development.

We are writing to raise an objection to the Planning Applications noted above. (SMD/2017/0046 and SMD/2017/0033) We would be grateful if our concerns could be addressed by yourselves, in a formal response.

Our grounds for concern are as follows:

Privacy

Our principal and strongest concern relates to the 'Annex' referred to in the Planning, Access & Heritage Statement.

The 'Annex' to the main building, which was originally built as stables, was converted in about 2002 from its use as a garage, into a meeting room with offices on the on the 1st floor, with three extra windows inserted into the side of the roof facing Shoobridge Street.

The text of the present application is somewhat ambiguous regarding future plans for the Annex, as the upper floor of the Annex is not specifically mentioned. There would be serious implications for privacy of nearby residents in Shoobridge St, if the upper floor office were to be converted to residential use.

The statement in the application:

"The proposal is therefore to change the use of Court Lodge from office and meeting rooms into a single residential dwelling", could be construed to include the 1st floor offices of the Annex.

This may be just a lack of precision in wording, but we understand that a local planning authority has a statutory duty to consider such matters.

The later statement regarding the Annex:

"With regard to the annex the rooms will initially remain as is but the lo ng term intention is to convert the meeting room downstairs back into a garage (which was its use up to 2002). If and when this goes ahead it would be subject to a separate planning application" does not mention the upper floor. This gives rise to our concern that the new owners may indeed intend to convert the upper floor offices, by default, to residential use, to which we would strongly object.

For the above reasons, even though we welcome the main building being converted back to a single dwelling, we object to the Application in its current form.

Yours sincerely,