

Burnett, James

From: Planning (SMDC)
Subject: FW: Comment Received from Public Access

-----Original Message-----

From: planning@staffmoorlands.gov.uk [<mailto:planning@staffmoorlands.gov.uk>]
Sent: Tuesday, May 03, 2016 9:44 AM
To: Planning (SMDC)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access

Application Reference No. : SMD/2016/0176 Site Address: Site at the corner of Alsop Street & Broad Street Broad Street LEEK STAFFORDSHIRE ST13 5NX Leek Comments by: Michael Quine

From:
20
Alsop St

Leek

ST13 5NZ

Submission: Objection

Comments: In many respects I welcome the Application, but there is one significant part of the application with which I cannot agree. This is about car parking provision. For the reasons stated below, I object to the application in its present form.

The Application says: 'There are no discernible negative impacts arising from the proposal', and it explains this by saying:

The nature and the location of the proposed development does not require any significant amount of parking. The site is sustainably located and well served by bus services. The close proximity of services and facilities means that walking is a realistic choice of transport mode.

The availability of public parking facilities in close proximity [?] (Brook St, Heywood St, High St, St Edward St) together with both controlled and uncontrolled parking opportunities in the immediate vicinity, means that neither visitors nor existing residents will be inconvenienced by the demands for parking.

I agree that the site is well served by bus services, but many who use buses also own cars. The fact that permission was granted for housing development and a given structure and layout in 2009 does not mean that conditions in place then are the same now. There is surely more need for car parking now than there was seven years ago.

The SMDC Parking Strategy 2008/2011 (I cannot find a later document) accepts 'that the road network within the District was not designed to accommodate the continually increasing number of vehicles that are vying for its use.

Congestion occurs when the demand for road space exceeds supply. I also read: 'Car parking must be considered in relation to the surrounding area to ensure existing on-street parking conditions are not worsened'.

The document goes on to say that 'the pressure on parking spaces and the willingness of motorists to avoid paying to park often results in the displacement of parking into those residential areas close to the town centre. This is often a source of complaints from local residents as these areas often have little or no parking available within the curtilage of their Property'. And Strategic Objective 4 of that document is/was to 'support the provision of appropriate 'on' and 'off' street car parking for residents in the Staffordshire Moorlands'.

This application does not offer appropriate off- and on-street parking.

Many other authorities have established guidelines for the number of car parking spaces required for new-build housing. As examples, Leicestershire County as a Highways Authority asks for a minimum of two car parking spaces for dwellings of 3 bedrooms or fewer: while in Scotland, Fife Council requires two allocated spaces for each dwelling of 2 - 3 bedrooms with, in addition, 0.25 of a space per dwelling as visitor parking.

Against those standards, 9 spaces for the proposed 7 dwellings will not be enough.

There's more. The proposed parking spaces will not be visible from the street, so I wonder how willing residents will be to drive in just in case there might be a space free. Human nature being what it is, if there is a space free on the street, it seems to me that both residents and visitors may find it simpler to park on the street. That might be eased 'for the first car in a household' if each of the spaces were to be allocated a specific and labelled place: is that allowed for?

As a result, there will be increased use of on-street parking whether on Broad St, or on Alsop Street and backing up into Hugo Street and its neighbours. Yet Alsop St and Hugo Street are already under great pressure from the number of two-car households and those working at the John Monroe Hospital: and Broad Street is already well parked and may have the added pressure of McDonalds' customers many of whom will surely find it easier to (try to) park on the street rather than crossing the flow of traffic to seek parking on that site.

Of course I agree with the proposition that residents should walk, cycle or use public transport: but that does not stop them having and using cars, and needing to park them without the negative impacts which the application says will not exist. I disagree with that part of the application.