

**Cannock Chase District Council**

**Planning Control Committee**

**24<sup>th</sup> March 2021**

**Officer Update Sheet**

**CH/20/075 - Retention of brick and panel fence, decking, and reed fence, widening of driveway including associated construction of retaining walls, and erection of boundary wall and fence to NE boundary (Part Retrospective) at Blue Cedars, 29, Beechmere Rise, Etchinghill, Rugeley, WS15 2XR**

Following compilation of the report for the Committee agenda, the following additional information was received:

**Officer Update for Committee (24.3.21)**

**Further Neighbour Objections:**

- A further 17 page letter including photographs and diagrams was received which reiterated the previous comments made relating to the structural capacity and appearance of the existing wall to the north western boundary.
- A further neighbour letter was received which stated

“ 6.12 it is hard to differentiate which wall is being discussed.

6.13 one of the the comments "pleased to see that alterations etc refers to the wall on the South East Boundary and then further down i.e "Trespass has occurred etc" refers to the North East Boundary.

I think when the Planning Committee read these documents in order to prepare for the meeting, that is if they do read them, it will be hard for them to give a considered decision on the application as it is very confusing.”

- A further objection was received from Rugeley Town Council.

## **Officer Response:**

Due to concerns about cracking in the wall on the North Eastern Boundary Officers can confirm that the site has been revisited by the applicant's structural engineer who has advised that remediation is needed that will in turn require partial rebuild.

The applicant has submitted a construction method statement outlining how remediation works would be undertaken by the applicant. Re-consultation on this remediation method statement has been undertaken with neighbouring residents and the Council's structural engineer.

The Council's structural engineer concurs with the recommendations of the remediation method statement and states that a final inspection should be undertaken by the applicant's structural engineer when the work is completed to ensure it has been completed in compliance with the method statement.

In respect to the comments relating to parts of the report referring to different walls and the potential for confusion Officers would clarify that the proposal entails various elements, namely: -

- (i) Retention of brick and panel fence, decking, and reed fence,
- (ii) widening of driveway including associated construction of retaining walls 9 to the south west boundary , and
- (iii) erection of boundary wall and fence to NE boundary (Part Retrospective)

It is therefore important to read each part of the officer report in its proper context. At page 6.11 the Structural Engineer makes it clear that he his first referring to the proposed retaining wall to the south west of the site before moving on to the Remedial works to the Existing Retaining Wall [which on the north east boundary of the application site and which abuts the properties on Penk Drive north].

The comments made on page 6.13 are comments received in response to publicity. As such one should read them from eth perspective of the person making the comments.