



FOREFRONT

DEVELOPMENT CONSULTING

9 Britannia Park, North Road, Stoke on Trent, ST6 2PZ
Office 01782 216912 WWW.FOREFRONTDC.UK

RESPONSE TO OBJECTIONS ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT

**Detailed Planning Application for
a single Dwelling on land at Micklea Lane, Longsdon,
Staffordshire, ST9 9QA**

This document has been prepared to respond to the objections submitted by interested third parties. It follows assessment of the letters available on line on the local planning authority's website.

I have grouped the comments together under the following topic areas

- Design
- Green Belt
- Privacy
- Sunlight
- Biodiversity and trees
- Drainage
- Non planning concerns

Design

One neighbour Sarah McCathie states that the design of the new house will not improve quality and character, but this is because she says that the site should remain as a green open space.

One neighbour states that the development of the site would affect the loose knit character of the area. However that character is not so well defined that the development would result in a serious loss of character.

Neighbours say the house will be 3 storey and therefore too tall in context. The design however will appear as two storey in views from public space, and visually will not appear out of character.

One neighbour believes the large hardstanding proposed would be out of character with front gardens of neighbouring houses. The hardstanding proposed could be reduced if required by imposing a condition on a planning permission. In addition the formation of hardsurfacing on neighbour's gardens would constitute Permitted development (if semi permeable) so the immediate context is capable of change.

One neighbour says the balcony proposed is not characteristic of the area. This does not however mean that it is an unacceptable feature, especially as it will not be readily visible.

Green Belt

Neighbours refer to the Green Belt designation of the area. One neighbour says no special circumstances have been advanced to justify the development. However the Design and Access statement includes a reasoned justification.

One neighbour states that Green Belt sites should not be developed until after Brownfield sites are redeveloped. However there is no planning policy requirement to resist greenfield development in preference to brownfield sites.

Privacy

Several objectors say the neighbours will experience loss of privacy, and overlooking from the proposed balcony. This is inaccurate as the proposed house will not have

windows overlooking the houses to either side. The proposed balcony will look out over the fields to the rear of the site, and if required screening on the ends of the balcony will prevent sideways views towards neighbours

Sunlight

One neighbour says lack of sunlight affects mood and mental health and the new house will affect sunlight experienced by neighbours. It is contended that the effect on daylight received by neighbours will be negligible and transient (i.e. affecting only a very short period in the day)

Biodiversity and trees

One neighbour refers to the fact that trees on the site have already been felled, and this has affected squirrels and pheasants. The removal of these trees did not require planning permission and the species allegedly affected are neither rare nor ecologically fragile (i.e. they are able to adapt easily to other nearby habitats)

Neighbours state the area is a haven for wildlife and will be destroyed by the new houses. This is not an accurate representation. The biodiversity value of the area is a reflection of the variety of ecosystems in the locality which includes the mosaic of the wide area including fields, hedgerows, gardens and trees. The application site is one small part of that array and is not in isolation so rare or valuable that its development will have a detrimental effect on biodiversity. Neither will its development for a single dwelling prevent or bar wildlife using the site or traversing the land.

Other points

Some third parties state that the proposed dwelling will not be an affordable unit because of its size and scale. However there is no planning policy requirement relating to these issues.

Several neighbours say the submitted plans are inaccurate as the garage extension to Woodlands to the side of the site is not shown. It is considered the principle issues relevant to this planning application are not wholly or significantly dependent on this aspect of the development.

Drainage

One neighbour mentions that the dwellings in this area need septic tanks and these have caused localised drainage problems. Such issues are a technical point which are capable of being addressed during construction, at the developer's expense.

Non planning concerns

These are issues raised which do not constitute material considerations to the planning application and cannot therefore be taken into account on reaching a decision. These include the following points

- Neighbours state that the site offers views of the countryside.
- One neighbour believes new houses should not be built until unsold ones are sold.
- Reduction in value
- Increased population