Burnett, James

Mr Clive Timmis

Non material amendment relating to SMD/2016/0105 for:

1. Changes to car parking layout at rear. Proposed changes are Unacceptable. See below

2. Amended rear addition roofs from glazing to tiled plots 1-5. Proposed changes Accepted

3. Amendment to front bay roofs of plots 1-4. Amendment not understood, detail required

References

Ref 1:	Apr 2016	2015-2051-05 Rev E Ground Plan
Ref 2:	Aug 2019	2051-36 AMENDMENT TO PLANNING PERMISSION - SITE PLAN
Ref 3:	Mar 2016	SCC Reinstatement of pathway to full height
Ref 4:	May 2016	SMD/2016/0105 Full Permission for Development
Ref 5:	Jan 2019	SMD 2019/0007 Non Conformance relating to Frontage dropped Kerb
Ref 6:	Jul 2017	Title Deed showing Land and Estate for Dwelling and Parking
Ref 7:	Dec 2018	SMD 2ELBFLXY Non Conformance relating to Car Park /Court Yard Kerbs and Edgings

Observations and Reasons for non-acceptance of the amendments covering changes to 1. Changes to car parking layout at rear:

1. Frontage Dropped Kerb

a. [Ref 2] The full original car park dropped kerb is maintained, this is contrary to the [Ref 3 and 4] and [Ref 1] that state the ¿remainder of the dropped kerb crossing across the frontage is to be removed and standard kerbs installed and pavement reinstated¿. This was raised at [Ref 5] Enforcement and is stated at as Highway Safety

b. There is also a Public Safety issue, regarding the dropped kerb, vehicles (this includes delivery vans) frequently manoeuvre onto the pavement when parking, consequently putting pedestrians at risk. The lack of a raised kerb provides no buffer or reference point when parking.

c. [Ref 4] Para 17 covers reinstatement of the existing site access iaw approved plans, reinstatement to full height. In the interest of highway safety and to avoid proliferation of overlong and redundant access crossing

2. Changes to car parking layout at rear

a. There are no individual car allocations detailed, these need to be identified on the plan(s) iaw [Ref 6] with the dimensions. These were detailed at [Ref 1].

b. [Ref 1 and Ref 7] The Car Park/Courtyard Hard Landscaping identifies the parking area tarmac with kerbs and edgings, these boundary treatments have not been applied. The current state of the yard boundaries has tarmac banked to interface the different levels of the car park and individual garden/yard boundary areas. This is not an acceptable solution.

c. [Ref 1] The driveway and access is to be formed in tarmac to the approval of Staffordshire Highway, the entrance is undulating and tarmac finish of an ¿unconvincing¿ quality and below an acceptable standard.

d. The main car parking area is ditto d. above and there has been limited grading or levelling to the overall site, in one area the tarmac is fragmenting.

e. Tarmac is laid directly to the Panel Fence on the boundary of Plot 5 property on Ford Street, nil edging or interface.

f. [Ref 1] Plots 2 and 3 should have a small brick boundary wall this been removed from the [Ref 2] plan. Not agreed with the owners.

g. The term ¿existing tarmac¿ is used on [Ref 2] plan, what is the relevance of existing ? clarification is required.