
From:
Sent: 10 September 2021 20:51
To:
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access

Application Reference No. : SMD/2021/0511
Site Address: 68 Heakley High Lane Brown Edge Staffordshire ST6 8RU Stoke On Trent
Comments by: Debbie Robinson

From:
64 High Lane
Brown Edge
Brown Edge
Stoke-on-Trent
Staffordshire
ST6 8RU

Phone:
Email:
Submission: Neither
Comments: Dear Sir/Madam,

Further to your letter dated 23rd August 2021 notifying me of the above referenced planning application, I am writing in reply to provide my comments.

I live next door to the applicant and the rear aspect to my property overlooks the detached stone store referenced in the application documents. The stone store building forms part of the rear boundary to my property, where it borders the applicant's. I have a good relationship with them, which I wish to maintain irrespective of the outcome of this planning application.

I observe from the submitted plans that the applicant intends to replace the detached stone store that I can see from my property, along with a detached double garage, which is not visible from my property as it is shielded from view by the ridge of the store building. As shown on the Existing Plans and Elevations (Drawing Ref: L(90)001 P1) the ridge of the stone store currently projects 4.0 metres from ground level. The rear wall of this structure is smooth rendered and forms part of my rear boundary, running into a brick wall that runs behind the garage on my property.

My concerns with the application are as follows:

1. The proposed dormer triple garage with office and playroom is significantly larger, both in scale and massing, than both of the structures it will replace. Based on my understanding of the scale drawings submitted with the application (Drawing ref: P2001 L (91)010 P1), it will have a projection of approximately 4.3 metres to the eaves and 6.9 metres to the ridge line. Not only is this significantly taller than either building being replaced, but the proposed triple garage is also significantly wider (at ~11.8 metres) than either of the existing buildings.

2. Being both significantly taller and wider than the existing structures, the proposed triple garage will greatly reduce the visual amenity of my property and that of my adjoining neighbour. Where the existing garage and stone store structures currently sit at a noticeably lower height, the proposed new structure will be unignorable - both in respect of its scale and relative proximity to my property. From the plans submitted I believe it will be an imposing new addition that sits at odds with the scale and nature of neighbouring dwellings.

3. The dormer windows shown on the proposed plan (Drawing ref: P2001 L (91)010 P1) will face in the general direction of my property and rear garden. Coupled with

the height of the proposed structure, I am concerned about my property becoming overlooked, in particular the master bedroom which is situated at the rear of the first floor of my property. I feel I will experience a loss of privacy, both while in my home and in my garden, as a result.

4. I do not know whether a loss of light or overshadowing will be a specific issue for me as a result of the proposed development, due to the relative position of my property. However, I am aware that some of my neighbours may be affected by this. I also cannot see anything in the application materials to reassure me that my property and garden will not be overshadowed by the taller and larger structure at certain times of day and year.

5. The scale and massing of the proposed triple garage, coupled with the floor plan (Drawing Ref: P2001 L (91)001 P1) showing bathroom facilities on the first floor of the building, give the appearance of a dwelling house rather than a garage. On this basis I feel the proposed development would be inappropriate in a semi-rural

setting, and raises the possibility that it could be sold separately as a dwelling house in the future.

6. There is nothing in the application or the accompanying drawings to indicate the form and nature of a boundary fence or wall that will replace the stone store building that is being removed as part of the proposal. As such I am further unsure of the security and aspect I will have at the rear of my property, on which I seek some reassurance from the applicant.

In sharing these comments and concerns, I am eager to point out that I am not opposed to development in general, and recognise that the applicant may wish to replace their existing garage and store. Were the proposed structure of a lower height at both the ridge line and the eaves, I believe I would find it acceptable.

Many thanks for kindly taking my comments and concerns into account when you come to determine this planning application.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs Debbie Robinson

Do you really need to print out this Email? Be green - keep it on the screen.

This email is intended for the addressee(s) only and may contain sensitive, privileged or confidential information that could be protectively marked. If you are not the addressee please do not use the information in any way. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it from your system. Thank you.

The Council may be required to disclose this email or any responses to it under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. The way in which we handle personal information is set out in our privacy notice and is available at <https://www.staffs Moorlands.gov.uk/YourData>
