From: planningcomments@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk
Sent: 15 November 2017 13:43
To: Planning Comments (SMDC)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access

Categories: Blue Category

Application Reference No. : SMD/2017/0630 Site Address: Saddlers Cottage Stanley Road Stockton Brook Staffordshire ST9 9LJ Stoke-on-trent
Comments by: Joanne Rost
From:

Market Place
Melbourne
Derby

Phone:
Email:
Submission: Objection
Comments: Planning application

SMD/2017/0630. Original application referred to SMD/2013/0102

My response to the planning application and the additions to this building are made independently. I have an interest in the area and am a regular visitor. I have an interest in architecture with some knowledge of listed buildings and I trained as a 3D designer.

INITIAL NOTES ABOUT THE APPLICATION.

1. Please note that the location plan showing the footprints of all of the nearby properties to Saddlers Cottage is not up to date. The adjacent property The Stables has a larger footprint. The proximity of these properties is very different to the actual situation and the more recent plans should be viewed when considering the planning application.

2. The garage application in 2013 was granted based on the need for the applicant and the property to have garage space for a vehicle and bikes, with room to turn a vehicle in the small amount of remaining land available. The original plans stated that this would be a modest not too high and simple garage (to minimise the impact on the surrounding environment) and built out of appropriate brick, stone and slate. The problems we are now addressing are because the owner has not followed the agreement of the original 2013 permission. It is not 'modest' as it now has vents, large cast iron grills and roof lights. (There may be other modifications I am not aware of.) If the modesty of the original design had been adhered to, this complaint would not be necessary. The plans of 2013 were already pushing the realms of acceptability as the garage had to be built very close to the boundary wall to allow for a vehicle to turn in the remaining space.

3. On the new application SMD2017/0630 the applicant has ticked 'no' to the question 'has work already been started without permission?' When in fact this is false as the work has been started and has been continuing during the application process.

4. The key additions proposed on new plans SMD/2017/0630

-Velux conservation roof lights

-Gable ventilation grill - salvaged and made from cast iron with arched head. To be placed on the front and rear elevations 'to replace previously approved oak windows and stone lintel.'

When were the windows approved? Windows were not mentioned on any previous plans.

On the original application SMD/2013/0102 the applicant ticked 'no' to windows indicating having no windows in the building and no reference made to windows on the plans. This is referred to in the second application 0630 only. The grills therefore cannot be a replacement for something not mentioned before.

4. Heritage statement made by Rob Duncan planning consultant, an independent report although he previously worked for the council's planning department.

-Dimensions are unchanged from original application (but the height of the building was never stated nor is it in this design and the dimensions not provided in detail on the previous application.)

3.4 - it is submitted that the provision of reclaimed cast iron grills complements the design and appearance of the garage?

On whose say so? A garage should be built out of sympathetic materials, certainly, and should not look out of place, but this additional feature just draws attention to a building which should be simple and unobtrusive and to quote 'modest'. Taste is a very difficult thing to measure, however this building has had many features added to it. All because these features are available to use, does not mean that you should include them.

3.5 - Velux roof lights - 'not out of keeping as the adjacent dwelling has 7 roof lights on northern and southern roof slopes. They will harmonise with surroundings.'

That is correct but I believe The Stables roof lights on the garage do not overlook adjacent properties or gardens as planning would not allow this even if the properties were a distance away.

The windows/roof lights on the main house were deemed necessary to provide light to the house as a home when the listed stable building was renovated many years ago. This can be checked on the historical planning applications. It would appear that they cannot be looked through with any ease and if they could, at the time, they did not overlook any immediate property. Each application has to be addressed separately, especially in an area with many variables and unique aspects. It is not appropriate to say ¿they have them so I want them'.

VERY IMPORTANT

The grill on the back of the property, overlooks the garden of The Stables. The roof light on the left hand side overlooks The Stables property directly.

Rob Duncan's heritage statement deals with how the garage visually affects the local landscape and if the additional features have any obtrusive impact on the architectural environment, it does not address the capacity to look through grills and roof lights and the proximity to an adjacent property.

The heritage statement does not address other features such as a more elaborate entrance, a second floor and possible glass bricks, as these were not disclosed to the planning consultant or were deemed unimportant.

5. The new application fails to address the addition of a substantial second floor which can be seen fractionally beneath the current garage door opening. The applicant has installed a second floor reducing the height of the main garage space. This means that any person on the second floor area could potentially look through the windows and ventilation grills towards the adjacent property and garden. The roof lights do not light the main garage but the second floor alone? Why is this necessary? The roof lights take on another level of significance as one of them looks directly across towards the adjacent property and the large grill, into the garden.

6. The original application does not mention windows, stating this is not applicable, although the grills are mentioned as a replacement for windows.

The original application 0102 stated it was a 'modest structure'.

The original drawings were of a reduced quality, there are a few tiny lines on front and rear top area of drawing which looks a bit like a feature but not clear what it is and it is not mentioned. It certainly does not look like a window and is not referred to at any point.

7. I believe that there are glass bricks on the back of the garage which have not been disclosed. It is currently difficult to see them but I have not seen any reference to them on the application.

Key things.

The applicant received permission to build this modest structure and when he eventually decided to build, he blatantly altered his plans with no intention of telling anyone.

On the planning application the applicant stated that he had not started on the work. Which clearly he has. It is virtually complete, grills, roof lights, vents and an undisclosed second floor. The applicant continued to work on the building prior to permission being given.

The applicant clearly believes this is acceptable and that planning permission is merely a paper work exercise rather than a robust procedure to ensure that buildings are suitable within a location.

There are errors in the application when referring to the replacement of windows to grills. Windows were never in original application.

The grills are not modest but quite decorative and without any purpose.

The grill at the rear and the window on the left side overlook the adjacent property. The installation of a second floor maybe unimportant to planning but when seen in relation to the roof lights, it has an impact.

The modest structure agreed to by the original planners is now not modest. It is high, over embellished and has a smaller ground floor interior due to the second floor.

Planning I understand has procedures and a limited amount of time to spend on very low priority applications. In my opinion whatever size the application it should be given sufficient time and consideration, not only on the impact to the visual landscape in a conservation area with some listed properties, but with some awareness of the effect on other people, in the immediate location, be it many or few. The current application can tell a great deal about the 'proposal', however this building has been built and is virtually complete. The most efficient way to understand its impact is to see it!