From: planningcomments@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk
To: Planning Comments (SMDC)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access
Date: 31 July 2019 18:47:07

Application Reference No. : SMD/2019/0420 Site Address: 44 School Lane Caverswall Staffordshire ST11 9EN Stoke-On-Trent
Comments by: Stephen Podszus
From:
3
Vicarage Crescent
Caverswaall
Stoke on Trent
Staffrordshire
ST11 9EW
Phone:
Email:
Submission: Objection
Comments: Planning Application Number SMD/2019/0420

44 School Lane, Caverswall, ST11 9EN

Dear Sir

With reference to the above planning application.

I wish to register my objection to the afore said planning application, on the following points.

A) Size of proposed extension

Having looked at the proposed planning application I noted that the footprint of the planned extension is the same as the present footprint of the existing property (minus the garage). This is not an extension but in fact another semi-detached house this I feel is totally out of context with the surrounding properties by its inappropriate size whilst also in relationship to the parcel of land it is proposed to be built upon.

B) Effect of extension on the surrounding area

In the early 1960¿s when these properties where built it can be seen that the planners clearly took into consideration the problems that would arise both then and in the future. The planning team came up with clear, sympathetic solutions to the surrounding area and tasks that they had been set. On inspection of one of the original planning team¿s solutions, it was deemed that this building where the extension is to be built was to be part of School Lane (No44), whilst the adjoining semi-detached be part of Vicarage Crescent (No2). At present the front of No44 is on the Building Line of all other properties in School Lane, whilst I understand that some minor extension work should be allowed over the Building Line. This which is stated above, is another semi-detached house footprint over the Building Line which I feel is excessive and will set a president for all planning applications in the future for all properties in School Lane. The proposed semi-detached (extension) will therefore become a dominant feature of the surrounding area detracting from the ambience that was strived for by the original planning team.

C) Safety with regard access in and out of Vicarage Crescent.

On the proposed planning application, it shows that provision for TWO parking space be made on the property with access from Vicarage Crescent. Could I point out that already with in 30meters of the Tee junction with School Lane there are five dropped drives for access to properties.

Numbers 1, 2, 3 and 4 plus the access to the electrical substation situated between No 1 and No3. If the drop kerb is allowed it will require a double drop kerb length as turning of vehicles would be unattainable due to the lack of turning space on the property. To position this double drop kerb, it would need to be put closer to the Tee junction in fact close to the 10 meters that is the required distance to park away from a Tee junction as stipulated by the Highway Code. Gaining access on to and out of Vicarage Crescent will become more hazardous especially when parents are dropping off or picking up children attending St Peter¿s school. Once again something I feel the original planning team can take credit for in their forward thinking by putting access to the semi-detached building on School Lane.