Burnett, James

From: Planning Comments (SMDC)
Subject: FW: Comment Received from Public Access

-----Original Message-----
From: planningcomments@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk [mailto:planningcomments@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk]
Sent: Friday, July 21, 2017 10:10 PM
To: Planning Comments (SMDC)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access

Application Reference No. : SMD/2017/0259 Site Address: 246 Leek Road Endon Staffordshire ST9 9EA Stoke On Trent
Comments by: Mr & Mrs J Shaw
From:
248
Leek Road
Endon
Stoke-on-Trent
Staffordshire
ST9 9EA
Submission: Neither
Comments: 1. The planning application title on the planning portal on SMDC website states that the side extension is single storey. However, the planning application (section 3) and plans state that the side extension is double storey.

2. On the list of people to be consulted on the planning application is Councilor Geoff Bond. Applicant (Fiona Bevington) is related Councilor Geoff Bond and has not disclosed this in section 9 of the planning application. Geoff Bond is Fiona Bevington¿s brother-in-law. Also, as far as we understand, Geoff and/or his wife still part own the property so there may be a conflict of interest.

3. In section 7 of the planning application, the applicant has answered no to the question of trees being within falling distance of the extension. This is incorrect as there is a large sycamore tree in a shared boundary between 246 and 248 Leek Road. This is clearly within falling distance of the proposed extension and indeed the existing property. We understand that this tree is preserved and we do not expect to see the tree pruned or removed to allow the works to be completed. We believe that pruning the tree would unbalance it and increase the risk of it falling onto our property.

4. In section 10 of the planning application, the applicant has stated that the front finish of the walls will be straw-colored brick to match the existing bricks. We know that the applicant¿s intention is to have the bricks rendered as stated on the plans. Also in section 10, the applicant has stated that the windows will be brown to match existing windows and doors but the applicant has recently had the windows and front door at the front of the property replaced and they are grey.

5. The site plan shows the side extension going out to the boundary edge of the property which contradicts the measurements of 1.5 meters shown on the plans. We know from personally experience, as we extended our property in 2012, that the applicant will need to install a steel reinforced concrete lintel to sit the external wall of the extension on as no solid ground will be found within reasonable depth. We know this because of personal experience when we found a redundant slurry pit under our extension site in 2012 which we know extends onto 246 Leek Road¿s land where their side extension is planned. When we installed our steel reinforced lintel we had to dig out to the side of where the lintel was being installed. If the applicant wants to extend to the boundary, or close to it, this will require access and disruption to our land. Because we have drains running close to our boundary edge, we will not grant this permission because it would disrupt our drains.

6. The plans show that the RWG at the side of the property will drain into the shared main drains at the front of the property which we also drain into. When we did our extension, we were told we had to install a stock away in the back garden to capture water falling at the side and rear of the property.

7. The window in the en-suite on the first floor of the proposed extension will overlook because it above the line of the existing fence and hedge boundary and we are concerned about lack of privacy and wish this to be at a minimum of obscuring glass.