
From: planningcomments@highpeak.gov.uk
Sent: 19 July 2018 07:19
To: Planning Comments (HPBC)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access

Application Reference No. : HPK/2018/0304 Site Address: 2 Amberley Drive Harpur Hill Buxton Derbyshire SK17 9PF
Buxton

Comments by: JOHN & MARIE WHITE

From:

4
AMBERLEY DRIVE
HARPUR HILL
BUXTON
DERBYSHIRE
SK17 9PF

Submission: Objection

Comments: As the Owners of Number 4 Amberley Drive, we would like to make a number of additional objections in respect of the above application.

1. After further consideration of the proposed plans (both original and amended), we would like to comment that the proposed 2 storey extension does not show a shaded area on the north-west elevation to identify the new brick work, both above and beyond the existing garage wall (assuming this is to be retained). We would like to request that further drawings are supplied which correctly show the proposed new wall on this side elevation.

2. In response to the 'Confirmation of Use' letter from the Applicant's husband Mr Ade Leigh, we have a number of comments as follows:

i. Mr Leigh's letter provides assurance that Mrs Leigh will only be doing 'hair at home' for friends and family on an ad-hoc basis. We request clarification that 'doing the hair of friends and family' means that there would be no financial consideration involved, and that 'ad-hoc' is something which takes place on a non-regular basis, and without any previous planning (ie appointments). As recently as Wednesday 27th June 2018, Mrs Leigh stated to us that she would be working approximately 2 days per week, and that she could only deal with 2 clients at a time. Each time we have discussed the matter with Mr & Mrs Leigh it has been on the basis of them converting the garage into a hairdressing facility (not a family/hobby/store room). At no point in any of our discussions has it been mentioned to us that it would only be friends and family on an ad-hoc basis and Mr & Mrs Leigh have both indicated that she would be 'working from home' for financial/business reasons. We are hopeful that the couple have now changed their mind about this intention, having been made aware of planning regulations for change of use by Mrs Barnes.

ii. Mr Leigh's letter states that the existing double garage is now to be converted into a family/hobby room useful for bike storage and equipment. As the revised plans no longer have another front door directly into it from the front, it is difficult to see how equipment and bikes will be easily manoeuvred to and from this room (ie through

the door to the newly created utility room at the back). It would be more convenient and sensible for the garage door to be retained for equipment and bikes to be manoeuvred easily.

iii. Equipment and bikes stored in this room would potentially be visible through the window from the pavement, only 5.9m away. It would be more visually appropriate for equipment and bikes to be hidden away from sight by retaining the garage door.

iv. Mr Leigh's letter states that the garage is to become a 'family/hobby room', whereas the proposed plans (amended) as at 05/07/2018 show it as a 'hobby room/store'. Further clarity is requested on the planning application documents in respect of the actual designation of the garage conversion.

v. Mr Leigh's letter states that 'any family or friends arriving by car can easily be accommodated on our driveway so there will not be any unsociable parking or movements to the detriments of neighbours'. The existing driveway, which measures 5.9m length x 4.9m width, can only accommodate the family's own two cars and our experience to-date is that that 'unsociable' parking is already taking place on a regular basis. The consultation response from County Planning Highways requires that 3 off-street parking spaces should be demonstrated and maintained, each at a minimum dimension of 2.4m x 5.5m, 'as any under-provision may result in vehicles being parked on the carriageway/footway of Amberley Drive, a situation considered against the best interests of the safe operation of the public highway'. Complete removal of the existing double garage would suggest that this requirement cannot be demonstrated, based on the existing dimensions of the driveway.