

Sundance,
The Avenue,
Stanley Moor
ST9 9LW

13th February 2018

To Whom It May Concern,

Re: Proposed Two Storey Extension to 1 The Avenue, Stanley Moor, ST9 9LW

I am now in receipt of the revised planning application for the proposed works to the above address. I assume that the lack of detail indicates that this proposed development is at the outline stage of planning.

Some of my earlier concerns have been addressed with respect to the mass and scale of the original proposed flank wall. However, the concern for the integrity of my retaining wall remains.

Find appended below my comments on the revised plans regarding the proposed development.

1. OVERLOOKING

Notwithstanding the two (2) metres of lowered roofline, the revised proposal **will continue** to have an adverse impact on the property immediately adjacent to the site (Sundance, The Avenue, ST9 9LW) and the surrounding area, by reason of overlooking, loss of privacy and visually overbearing impact. This will affect primarily Sundance and to some extent, Copper Beeches (No.3) in The Avenue. The new proposed two storey building continues to overlook two bungalows (2 Moorhead Drive and 'Green Meadows'). These currently sit on both the western and the rear boundaries of No. 1, The Avenue.

The foreshortened distance between the proposed new flank wall of No 1, The Avenue and the side of the adjacent property 'Sundance' remains an issue. This may still affect the light available to the side entrance to Sundance, patio and the principle rear windows on the rear elevation of Sundance.

As in my original submission I refer to the SMDC's own Supplementary Planning Documents contained within 'Planning Guidance' **Appendix 3.4(4)**.

2. RIGHT TO LIGHT

The revised submission will go some way to address my concerns with regard to available light to the patio and windows to the main habitable rooms which are all at the rear of Sundance.

I am grateful that the new plans show the rights of light analysis, as you can see, **my rights are already compromised by the existing single storey building**, and these sight lines are only shown in the horizontal plane and not the vertical one. This is a cause for concern as I believe that the proximity and

two storey height of the proposed extension will continue to adversely affect the house and garden and my enjoyment of it.

I contend that although a light analysis appears to have been completed in the horizontal plane, **even with the reduced height on the last 2.6 metres of the proposed development, this may not be sufficient to redress the adverse effect on light levels to my rear garden and windows to habitable rooms.**

I consider an analysis of available light in the vertical plane (Vertical Sky Component) would be the appropriate. I would refer the committee to: ***The Building Research Establishment (BRE) document 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A guide for good practice (2011).***

The following tests are recommended: Vertical Sky Component; Daylight distribution/No Skyline; Average Daylight Factor (ADF); Room Depth

As previously stated, the front and side elevations of Sundance face south-west. The revised proposal will still effectively block the sunlight from this direction for a large part of the afternoon, exacerbated during the winter months when the angle of the sun is lower relative to the horizon.

My original objection made reference to the SMDC's own Supplementary Planning Documents contained within 'Planning Guidance' **Appendix 3.4 (11)-Daylight**. This principle still applies and I refer you to my original submission.

3. RISK OF SUBSIDENCE

My grave concerns with regard to the risk of subsidence to my retaining wall and consequent effects on the stability of my driveway and main building remain. I must reiterate my original comments:

Excavations on the scale that will be required for this massive two storey extension **may undermine the retaining wall running between the adjoining plots.** Damage to the integrity of this wall could lead to collapse of my driveway and possible subsidence of buildings. Retaining walls hold inherent vulnerabilities which must be taken in to consideration.

I have both a right of support and right of access to maintain the wall. **These rights have already been infringed by the construction of the existing single storey extension. (Photographs to follow).**

The proximity of the proposed extension will make it impossible to inspect and maintain the retaining wall. It is vital that the wall is capable of being maintained in the event of damage from the development leading to collapse and subsequent erosion of both my driveway and side patio area.

In order to avoid construction issues and so as not to compromise the safety of the retaining wall and preserve its future maintenance, then I suggest that the proposed extension be set back from the boundary wall by between 90 and 100cm. This will also allow for the provision of drainage to take the roof water.

4. INCREASE IN ROOF AREA AND DRAINAGE

Building over or close to a public sewer will require written agreement from the sewerage undertaker. I have seen the response from Severn Trent Water Authority and I note that there may be a public sewer located within the construction site.

Building over an existing drain or sewer can damage pipes, so that they leak or block, potentially leading to odour nuisance, health problems and environmental damage. It also makes it more difficult, time consuming and expensive to clear blockages and repair or replace faulty drains. So if there is an existing drain below, **or close to**, the proposed extension, it may need to be moved or protected. There is a drain (for foul and rain water) running the length of the driveway in 'Sundance' which may be affected by excavations. Two inspection chambers are also situated on the property.

It is generally recommended that the route of drains should avoid obstructions (e.g. ponds or outbuildings) and **keep away from foundations**.

A larger roof area will increase the amount of surface water generated by rainwater from the roof.

Infiltration via a soakaway will be impossible because of the proximity of the foundations of the retaining wall and **existing high groundwater levels**.

Mrs. Harper has commented to me in the past on the poor drainage and concomitant odours she experienced.

It will be necessary to discharge the surface water into a surface water sewer or combined sewer. I cannot see any provision for the disposal of roof water from the increased surface area of the new development.

The eaves gutter indicated on the plans over sails my retaining wall. There is no rainwater pipe shown and I assume that since there is no room to install a gully and storm water drain that it is to discharge onto the existing lower roof.

This would overburden the existing capability of the eaves gutter. This eaves gutter has never been maintained and is full of detritus (see photograph). If the proposed works are allowed then it becomes impossible to maintain even more of the wall which is of great concern.

The construction of the proposed extension (if allowed adjacent to the boundary retaining wall) will destabilise the foundation of the retaining wall, there being a clash as to the juxtaposition of the foundations. The existing foundation of the retaining wall will be compromised by either digging alongside or under it.

5. BOUNDARY INACCURACY

There can be no assumption that the boundary bisects what is, after all, my retaining wall. If this wall failed for any reason, am I to assume the cost of repair would be shared by Mr. and Mrs. Harper?

6. INAPPROPRIATE STREET SCENE

The amended proposal continues to be an anomaly within the street scene of The Avenue. I refer again to the document '**Design Principles for Development in the Staffordshire Moorlands**'.

I will provide a hard copy of this letter to Case Officer Chris Johnston, together with photographs as referred to. These will provide a clearer illustration of the impact and proximity of the proposed extension than is currently afforded by the plans and projections submitted. These will demonstrate the impact of the proposed construction overall.

Yours faithfully,

Christina A. M. Poole BA (Cantab)

Email:

Mob:

Land: