From: Tim Barber
To: Planning Comments (CBC)
Subject: Planning Application 20/02230/HSD Cavanagh 13 Crossfield Avenue Knypersley
Date: 06 December 2020 08:04:36

Dear Sirs

Re the above, please find below our comments;

As per our comments on the previously approved application, we have no issues with Mr Cavanagh building a garage at the rear of his property. The fact the new plans are for a smaller footprint also gets over some of our original concerns.

The sooner the new structure is built, and the whole site tidied up, the better as currently it's a totally unacceptable mess that we have to look out on. Our visual amenity is severely impacted by the current state of the site and items stored on it yet the Planning Department seem unwilling to intervene despite having the powers to do so.

We also have concerns that are a matter for planning as follows;
As per the original application, the new application states there are no trees or hedges within falling distance of the proposed building and no pruning will be required, this is completely untrue. The rear garden has substantial trees and Hedges on all 3 borders that are all well within falling distance of the new structure and will need to be pruned, pictures can be supplied. In fact Mr Cavanagh has recently pruned the hedges and, as usual, has left the cuttings to rot in an untidy mess which attracts Rodents namely Rats.

Why is this a question on a planning application if it isn't relevant, why has the applicant once again given an incorrect answer to this question and why do planning seem to ignore this?

Following that, it seems the applicant has a total disregard for the planning process. Inaccurate answers on two applications, removal of a sewage inspection chamber without permission or punishment, building the garage slab to a completely different size than on the approved plans in the hope he wouldn't be caught out, erecting a popup garage in front of the property line without seeking permission and storing building materials all around the property in an untidy and unsightly manner.

Re the latter, planning have powers under the Town and Country Planning Act to intervene, however, it seems if it involves additional work then they can't be bothered. In the meantime ourselves and the neighbours at number 17 have to put up with scrap materials and building materials being placed and wedged on the boundary fences causing a visual eyesore.

We don't wish to sit in our living room and have to look at scrap polystyrene sheets stacked higher than our fence but nobody can be bothered to help sort this out. I wager that if this was going on next door to a Planning Officers house then it would be swiftly dealt with.

Re the popup garage that has now been in situ in front of the property line for 2.5 years without planning permission, a Planning Officer has recently given the applicant permission for this to remain until the new garage is built. Our concerns with this decision are there are no timescales attached to this. Given no work has taken place on the new garage since April, and no work appears to be going to be done in the foreseeable future, how many years will we have to sit and look at the eyesore in front of our property?

The fact planning won't give an answer to this question, or put a timescale on how long the popup garage can remain in situ, is unacceptable. Why can't a condition be placed on this current application that the popup garage can only be in place for a reasonable set time period?

Re the application and parking, the original application was for a double garage that was to house the applicants two sas-
roadworthy cars. The revised application is for a single garage which will only house one of these cars. Where is the other vehicle going to be stored going forward, in the popup garage in front of the property line? If the latter, will Mr Cavanagh still use the turning circle in the narrow Avenue as his own personal parking space, causing an obstruction and traffic problems on a daily basis? How does that sit with the Highways assessment on the original application and does this need to be revisited?

Finally, as previously stated, we have no concerns with the proposed new footprint of the garage. However, the reduction in width of the building isn't in proportion with the reduction in ridge height. This means the revised garage will have a steeper roof pitch than the original planned structure and visually will not be in keeping with similar development in the vicinity, this is an area of concern and we'd prefer to look at a building with a lower ridge height.

Regards

Mr and Mrs T Barber 13 Crossfield Avenue Knypersley