

**From:** [planningcomments@staffs Moorlands.gov.uk](mailto:planningcomments@staffs Moorlands.gov.uk)  
**To:** [Planning Comments \(SMDC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Comment Received from Public Access  
**Date:** 26 June 2017 20:35:47

---

Application Reference No. : SMD/2017/0390 Site Address: Stanford House DENSTONE LANE ALTON STAFFORDSHIRE ST10 4AX Stoke On Trent

Comments by: Alex Clowes

From:

5

Alverton court

Alton

Alton

Phone:

Email:

Submission: Objection

Comments: Before discussing the planning proposal there are a few issues I wish to question with the application and the information provided.

Point 6. States prior advice not sought I do not believe this correct as the planning department were advised of the development and visited the site due to a believed breach in planning and health and safety.

A number of the consultations appear to be questionable I.e 11 Denstone lane is owned by the applicant or family and is at the rear of his property and has recently had the boundary hedge removed to create one large site. No one lives there. The Alverton Hotel is also owned by the applicants family and is being turned in residential houses and lived in by family members. No planning is currently submitted for a change of use and this is still a business premise. Therefore the only consultation that would be of consideration is those at Alverton Court and other local authority members the others should not be considered.

In terms of the actual plans I have a few points which at this point give me reason to object but greater clarity in the plans would hopefully alleviate this concern. I will now summarise these:

1. The plans do not accurately represent the site and are not to scale. The path is an easement featuring on the deeds of all properties on the site and Stanford house is the servient tenement. 1-5 Alverton Court the dominant tenements. The applicant has every right to move the path but must provide the easement unblocked elsewhere. The path is already against the tree and hedge with a 10ft drop to the main road below and subsiding bank side which would place users in danger if moved. The path was installed as a condition of planning for the site and its path and elevation is critical to wheel and pushchair use and the easement should be of the same width and size as when purchased in law. The granting of planning would make such a body liable for any health and safety issues arising.

2. Similar to above there is no clarity on the route of the path the construction material of the path or the safety of the path for its users. A site visit is needed to assess this or the path needs to be removed and the easement rerouted across the land where users would be safe. The easement can not be blocked and is lawfully present granting the blocking of it would impact on all parties involved.

3. There is scope for the garage itself to move north or east or north east in order to negate any impact on the legal easement serving 5 family homes. Again as above the path has a matter of inches for moving and would be a health and safety issue. The garage has meters to the rear and north.

4. The design of the garage is good however the white render is not in keeping with any other building in the area other than the extension next to it at Stanford House which was only recently rendered by the owners which was previously brick months ago.

One of the main objections is that planning appears to only be being sought after residents found Mr Draycott with no consultation ripping up the easement and laying the foundations for the said garage during a day when most residents were at work. From seeing the plans it is clear these require planning and that the easement

would have been illegally blocked intentionally. The occupant is an estate agent who would or should no such details it was only residents interventions that stopped this. The owner appears to have a total disregard for the local area and the rights of other private and public bodies. The easement is the only foot access to the village for the community living at this site and it legally must be maintained.

5. There is no way the path can move closer to the beech tree without damaging it and the plans give a false impression of the path clearly aknowledge on the plan. A sound judgement can not be made from such a drawing

That said I would be willing to support the development of the garage if such concerns could be alleviated in proper scaled plans. Damaging the ground in this area would further destabilise the ground and not only put those using the easement at risk but also traffic on the main road below moving to and from Alton towers which is already seeing subsidence.