

From: planningcomments@highpeak.gov.uk
To: [Planning Comments \(HPBC\)](#)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access
Date: 19 November 2022 16:52:21

Application Reference No. : HPK/2022/0383
Site Address: 10 Robertson Road Buxton Derbyshire SK17 9DY Buxton
Comments by: Christine Marrison
From:
Overstone
8 Robertson Road
Next door neighbours
Buxton

SK17 9DY
Phone:
Email:
Submission: Objection
Comments: We received the above planning application on Tuesday 8th November.

Subject to your Committee's approval, we have no objection either to the proposed extension to the existing house, or the proposed modification to widen the driveway.

Our comments relate only to the proposed ancillary accommodation.

We are disappointed to hear the full details of the proposed ancillary accommodation. In our brief conversation with Mrs Smith, we were informed that the replacement to the existing outbuilding (the building to be demolished) would be bigger, but we were given no idea of how much bigger. There was also a fleeting reference to the possibility of a future change in use from a study/gym to accommodation for the occupant's parents at a later date, but no other details were forthcoming.

We have considerable concerns about this proposed structure.

There appear to be considerable inconsistencies in the plans regarding measurements and some mix-up with north/south elevations, which we hope can be addressed before the plans reach the determination process. The comments we would like to submit are as follows.

Comments - Plans

▪ We are concerned about the proposed length and height. The proposed ancillary building appears to be approx. 10 to 11 metres in length, which is longer than many detached bungalows. The whole proposed structure is [we think] about six times larger than the outhouse it would be replacing. It is impossible to be precise on this issue because of several inconsistencies between the different sheets of the plans submitted.

▪ The proposed building is angled differently from the existing outhouse and appears to run closer and parallel to the boundary/retaining wall. From the plan it is difficult to gauge the distance between the proposed structure and the existing stone boundary/retaining wall. This raises the question for us about the danger that digging the foundation of the proposed structure could damage the stone boundary/retaining wall. Also, would there be sufficient space to carry out maintenance work between the proposed structure in the future, should it

be required?

▪ This information was obtained using the 'Sun Calc' app. The shadow length across our garden from a 6.6-metre-high structure would be 28.55 metres during the month of December. In April and September, the shadow would be approximately 9 metres. This is likely to block considerable light from the ground floor windows running along the side of our property. Most of our windows are at the side of the property which would look directly towards the proposed structure. (Again, it is impossible to be precise because there are inconsistencies on the height in the drawings. On drawing 7029 - PL09 the height is approximately 6.6 metres tall, on drawing 7029 - it is approximately 5 metres tall).

▪ Drawing number: 7029 ' PL10, proposed elevations. It appears that in this drawing elevations north and south are the wrong way round, as can be seen from the slope of the land. Furthermore, 'the indicative height of the boundary wall' is incorrectly specified since the boundary wall as it exists slopes down markedly to the bottom of the garden, whereas in the drawing it appears to be horizontal with the building.

▪ The consequence of this is that the (west end) elevation of the proposed building, which is nearest to the rear gardens of College Road, will be distinctly higher than it appears on the plans, it would be 3.2 metres higher than the boundary wall at the boundary walls highest point and considerably more at its lowest point.

▪ This is a point relevant to the conservation area. All the rear extensions undertaken to properties on Robertson Road and College Road have been stone-built extensions to the existing house. Conservatories, garden sheds, and a few garages apart, this proposed building would be the only separate substantial development not in stone. We believe the materials proposed and the ultra-modern design (aluminium framework) would be out of keeping with the conservation area.

▪ Unmapped Sewers documentation submitted by Severn Trent Water.

We have read the document entitled 'Unmapped Sewers' but do not understand it or its significance. We have concerns about sewerage and rainwater drainage which are not explained in the drawings provided. We cannot see any reference in the drawings to this issue. We also are concerned that the space between the proposed structure and the boundary/retaining wall is insufficient for the dispersal of rainwater by whatever means.

Comments ' Heritage Statement submitted by Smashbox Architecture.

●The Statement claims that 'Properties along Robertson Road are mainly 20th Century'.

We do not believe this to be true. It is our belief that most of the houses in the road were built between about 1880 and 1899. We also believe this to be true of the houses overlooking this proposed development from College Road and Green Lane.

● The statement claims that '10 Robertson Road has some individual historical significance to the conservation area ' [but that] The architectural significance has been somewhat eroded by additions approved in the past'.

We have been told that there have been no modifications or additions to the building since it was built, and visual evidence confirms this. The room over the garage and the outhouse are part of the original house (requested by the first owners) and are of course totally in keeping with the rest of the property. The adjoining semi has been extended but number ten was always the larger property of the two.

● The statement claims 'The proposals are residential in character'.

The proposals are indeed residential in character, but this does not mean that the proposed structure would be in keeping with the external character of the conservation area.

● The statement claims that 'In terms of longer views around the conservation area ' [the proposal] will have neutral impact'.

The large, proposed detached dwelling would be seen from several angles and would be visible from both Robertson Road and College Road.

● The statement claims ;However, the outbuilding is set back from the front elevation and any impacts are limited to the immediate context;

The immediate context is indeed the conservation area itself as viewed from the backs of the properties on Robertson and College Road. The impact on our property would be considerable in this respect.

To summarise, we would prefer this proposed structure not to be built due to the length and height of the building together with its ultra-modern appearance not being in sympathy with the character of the conservation area.

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.highpeak.gov.uk/YourData>
