From: planningcomments@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk
Sent: 23 August 2017 14:04
To: Planning Comments (SMDC)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access

Categories: Red Category

Application Reference No. : SMD/2017/0476
Site Address: 8 Sunnyside Springfield Drive Leek Staffordshire ST13 6ET Leek
Comments by: Jane Daly
From:
Dunvegan
Birchall Lane
Leek
Leek

Phone:
Email:
Submission: Objection
Comments: I have the following points to raise on this application:

1. Although this is a built up neighbourhood, the bungalows in this area of the private lane of Springfield Drive, were laid out and designed to protect privacy and openness. The position of the garage at No.8 and the flat roof design of the garage at No.8 is an important part of this private and open neighbourhood.

The proposed side extension on the southern boundary of No.8 will change the nature of the neighbourhood: The massive increase in height and further expansion of the footprint of the building to the southern boundary, will impact adversely on the light and openness of the rear gardens of Nos. 10, 11 and 12 Springfield Drive. In particular, the increased height will be overbearing on the rear living accommodation and garden at No.11 and will severely affect the use and quiet enjoyment of the dwelling and garden that has been enjoyed by the owners since they built No.11 in 1967. The increased height will take away light and views of the sky and change the openness from both inside and outside of No.11.

2. The plans for the proposed new development do not show any driveway to the outbuilding at the rear of No.8. It appears that this prefabricated structure is to become the permanent garage for No.8. Like the proposed side extension, this proposed extension of the driveway to the prefabricated garage, will have a serious negative impact on the use and quiet enjoyment of the owners of Nos. 10, 11 and 12 Springfield Drive, and again, in particular, the owners of No.11: The established vehicular access on the site to the original garage, is screened from No.10 with a boundary fence owned by No.10, and deep leylandi hedging owned by No.8. Under the proposed development, the driveway to the prefabricated garage will run the full width of the northern boundaries of both Nos. 10 and 11. This new extended driveway will cause noise, disturbance and pollution that will severely impact on No.11. The plans do not show any proposed screening or landscaping to provide any buffer from vehicles driving in and reversing out of the prefabricated garage. There is no information on the plans of any vehicular turning area next to the prefabricated garage so it may be that vehicles will have to reverse some distance from the rear garage to the front of No.8. Furthermore, it appears that the distance between the proposed side extension and the boundary with Nos. 10 and 11 will be extremely narrow for a vehicular access and screening. The extended driveway will have to run immediately next to the boundary fence owned by No.11. Consequently, it seems that the side extension and new

driveway to the prefabricated garage is overdevelopment . Both the extension and driveway are being crammed into the southern boundary with a severe negative impact to the immediate neighbours.

3. The height of the boundary fence has been raised by the owners of No.11 to block out the prefabricated outbuilding. No doubt outside lighting to the rear garage will need to be installed and this, together with bright headlights of vehicles accessing the rear garage, will cause unacceptable disturbance to the bedrooms on the rear of Nos. 11 and 12. Continuation of the leylandi hedging which screens No.10, is essential to screen No.11 from traffic to and from the prefabricated garage.

4. There is concern about the prefabricated garage; in particular, its size, build quality, the presence of a chimney, and the overhead electric cables providing power to the structure. This is not part of the planning application but we trust that the planning officer and/or councilors will be satisfied that it complies with all legal requirements. It is noted that the Council¿s environmental health department has been notified of the application. The build quality and design of this structure is not in keeping with the quality of the dwelling especially it is to be the main garage for Sunnyside.

5. There is no objection to the proposed extension to the rear of No.8. It is open to question why the development to the southern boundary is not planned on the northern and /or eastern boundaries where there is far more space to extend and an extension here would have little or no impact on neighbouring properties.

6. Contrary to the application, the property cannot be seen from a pubic road or other public land. The planning officer should inspect the development site from the rear of Nos. 10, 11 and 12 to see the nature of the neighbourhood here and the negative impact the proposed development would have.

7. The drive is privately owned by the frontagers and is a narrow, single track lane. Any developer needs to be mindful of the damage that heavy construction vehicles could cause to the surface of the lane and the gas and water pipes that run close to the surface of the lane.

In conclusion, the proposed extension to the southern boundary is of excessive height. This, together with the permanent location of a garage to the rear of No.8 and consequent access immediately on the boundary with nos.10 and 11, is overdevelopment causing cramming. The increased height of the dwelling on this southern boundary will be overbearing on No.11. and have serious negative impact on Nos. 10, 11, and 12 particularly, loss of light, openness and privacy. This will change the nature and feel of this neighbourhood. The lack of provision for screening and buffer planting within the boundary of No.8, is unacceptable.

For these reasons, permission should be refused.