
From: planningcomments@highpeak.gov.uk
Sent: 05 August 2023 14:53
To: Planning Comments (HPBC)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access

Categories:

Application Reference No. : HPK/2023/0263 Site Address: 9 Stoneridge Park Road Buxton Derbyshire SK17 6SG
Buxton Comments by: Mrs Sandra Budd

From:

7
Park Road
Neighbouring property
Buxton
High Peak
SK17 6SG

Submission: Objection
Comments: Mrs S Budd

Response to Planning Application HPK/2023/0263 9 Park Road, SK17 6SG

I agree entirely that the current structure is in need of demolition before it collapses. Over the last 2 years the lean to the garage has caused a split in my pathway along its complete length.

However due to inaccuracies and omissions in the submission I have to ask for the application in its present form to be rejected for the following reasons:

- Ownership Certificate and Agricultural Land Declaration

Mr Duncan has answered that 'no-one other than the applicant owns the land'. However, there is encroachment on to my land to the west and south marked in brown on the land registry title plan, of roof eaves, gutters and no doubt foundations, as the present structure abuts the land. Any new structure using the existing footprint would need to have foundations under my land. Therefore, Ownership Certificate A which accompanies Mr Duncan's application is incorrect and Certificate B is relevant to this application.

- Trees and Hedges

In answering this question, Mr Duncan has responded that there are no trees or hedges on land adjacent to the proposed development site that could influence the development or might be important to the local landscape character. However, there is a large imposing mature tree (split into six large trunks) which is of significant visual and environmental value to the street scene and the wider conservation area. Sited in the corner of the garden of 5 Park Road, it is situated much closer to the development site than indicated on plan 4 of the application. This, together with the trees and hedging along the joint boundary line with 5 Park Road would indicate a tree survey is also missing from this application.

- Biodiversity and Geological Conservation

Mr Duncan has answered that there is no reasonable likelihood that any important biodiversity or geological conservation features may be present or nearby the development site. There are many trees near to the proposed site including the large mature multi-trunked tree which overhangs the site, neighbouring old buildings, a large nearby church, small woodland area, as well as the existing garage itself, which could very likely provide a habitat suitable for utilisation by roosting bats. Therefore, in the absence of an ecological survey, I would strongly disagree with the certainty of Mr Duncan's answers within this section, and to ensure the safeguarding of any protected wildlife, request that an investigation is carried out into the presence of bats at the site, and submitted alongside Mr Duncan's application.

In addition to the above, I have further comments regarding the application in its current form:

- Clarification regarding Access to the Site

In the 'Proposed Roof Plan' (document no.4) Mr Duncan uses the term 'Free Access' to describe an area on the South and West perimeter of the garage. To be clear, the land is owned by 7 Park Road. Mr Duncan has the 'full right and liberty to pass and repass on foot with or without hand-propelled or similar sized vehicles over and along the land shown coloured brown' on the land registry title plan, but he does not own it.

A new garage should not encroach in any way onto this area, and access by workmen and machinery onto the site is limited by Mr Duncan's terms of his right of access. No access to any land coloured in yellow would be granted. Additionally, throughout the duration of the build, unrestricted access will be required by 7 Park Road over and along the land shown in brown on the Plan, at all times. Mr Duncan will be required to make good, without delay, any damage caused to land and property owned by 7 Park Road.

- Exterior

In Mr Duncan's Heritage Plan, he refers only to the 'East Wall and North Apex' as being visible from the road. However, the west wall can also be seen along its length from the road. The south wall is also partly visible from St Johns Church (much more so in autumn and winter) but a taller building would be much more prominent. There is no mention of the materials he proposes to use on the West and South Walls. Within the column 'Justification/Mitigation', reference is made to the cost of the materials and I presume this reference is for the suggested use of K render as opposed to natural stone. With particular consideration given to the fact that we are in a Conservation Area, I would request that in the best interests of retaining the historic character of the area and to blend in with the existing surrounding buildings that natural stone is used on all four walls, and any cost cutting to use cheaper materials is considered inappropriate.

- Design

i) Increased height of walls

I consider the proposal to increase the height of the walls by a further metre would produce a building out of proportion and out of character with its surroundings. The overbearing impact of a building some 4.3 metres high on a plot for a domestic garage would be significant. While the desire to park a van within the new structure is the justification for Mr Duncan wishing to increase the height of the garage, what is proposed goes far beyond that of a normal single domestic garage and becomes akin to a two-storey dwelling. On checking, most vans used for domestic purposes are under 2 metres in height. The proposal will increase the vehicular entrance height to 3 metres which based on the above feels an unnecessary and overdeveloped alteration. The existing structure, at a metre lower, is already within the lower branches of the canopy of the large multi-trunked tree previously mentioned. Building higher into the tree would inevitably cause damage to it and the wildlife inhabiting it.

ii) Doors and windows

The existing garage was originally part of my property before it was subsequently sold prior to my ownership and therefore the existing openings, particularly on the south wall, have historic reference as to their location and outlook onto my property. In particular, there was a door opening on the rear elevation leading to my rear garden as well as a small window. The door has since been blocked up while the window remains.

In the proposed replacement structure, the door has been reinstated and the window replaced, like for like, when in reality they have no purpose, as identified by the fact the door has been previously blocked up. There is adequate access to the garage proposed via the front and side elevations and there is also more than enough natural light

provided by the multiple other openings proposed. Therefore, I would request that the proposals be amended to remove any openings on the rear elevation as they add no design benefit and even though they are proposed to be obscured, provide impact on my amenity.

- Condition of Use

Within the Heritage Statement, Mr Duncan states that he wishes to maintain a coaching house image although it never was one. By definition a coaching house is designed with a living area above a garage or stabling. This along with the proposed increase in height does raise concerns with the current and future intended use of the building. I would request that should the LPA approve the replacement of the garage, in whichever final form, safeguards are imposed that the future use of the building is restricted to use as a domestic garage for a private vehicle and storage only, and that it is expressly prohibited that the proposed new building is used for any commercial activities, or as a dwelling.

Document submitted via High Peak Planning Portal and extract of Land Registry Title Plan referenced within the document submitted via email for ease of reference.

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>
