119 John Street,
Biddulph. ST8 6HP

29th November, 2017

PLANNING APPLICATION REF: SMD/2017/0653

We are owner occupiers of the above numbered property, and formally object to the proposals for a single bungalow to the rear of our garden.

We note, incidentally, that according to the consultations record, the occupiers of 10 – 16 Heath Street and 121 John Street have not been notified as affected parties, and who are likely to have comments, particularly on traffic and parking issues. Those residents should also be made aware of the proposals. Notices posted on lamp posts and the like are not good enough. The applicant's agent must be instructed to notify accordingly, and if necessary the consultation period should be extended. It could be argued that without proper consultations the application should not have been validated.

The proposals affect our property as follows:

1. An attractive feature of our garden, and one of the factors which influenced our decision to move to 119 John Street a year ago, is the west facing mellowed brick wall forming our entire rear boundary, which at almost 3m high adds to: a) the walled garden effect, and b) the security of that boundary. It was our intention to dress the wall with wires, vines and espalier fruit trees. It is this entire wall which the proposals would reduce to 1.5m, half its present height. Our planting proposals would not then be viable.
2. We assume that the applicant has checked that he has the right to reduce the wall, and that it is not deemed to be a party wall.
3. Its reduction would seriously and permanently compromise our privacy, security and amenity, in addition to the considerable aesthetic loss. The pathway along the boundary would allow a sightline over the wall into our garden.
4. The wall is presently buttressed by dividing walls forming the garages, and is unbonded for its full height at the junction of two of the garages. The loss of the buttressing and the deadweight could well result in its instability and probable entire collapse. Its stability could not be assured, and we would always be conscious of that issue whenever our children are playing in our garden.
5. The ridge height of the proposed property would be approximately 5m above ground level,with an eaves height of 2.5m, and given that the land on which it sits is already elevated from our floor level, would be an overbearing and intrusive structure, less than 1m from the reduced wall. The bathroom window would overlook our garden, albeit with obscured glass.
6. It is not impossible that at some time in the future the then property owner could exercise his permitted development rights to provide accommodation in the roof space, along with dormer windows and/or rooflights, which could also overlook our property, without LPA control.
7. The existing garage roof is asbestos cement. Fibres could well be released during the demolition process.
8. Bats are known to be present, having been seen flying around our garden, and which are

possibly roosting in the corrugations in the roof structure of the disused garages.

The Proposed Property:

1. The access road appears to be unmade, unadopted and not maintained at public expense. Additional traffic and parking would only result in further deterioration, and would make the local problematic parking problems worse.
2. LPA policy requires at least 1.5 off-road parking spaces per property. Only one is possible. Visitor or resident parking associated with the property would have to use the unmade roadway, blocking through access.
3. Local Plan, 8.3, Spatial Objectives: H1 New Housing Para. 3E requires adequate private amenity space within the curtilage. We suspect that the amenity space provided is far less than the required minimum.
4. The rear elevation contains principal windows, only 2.5m from a 2m high boundary wall. Any later alterations to that boundary wall would have deleterious effects on the privacy of No. 2 Heath Street.
5. The three terraced houses on Heath Street use a route from the rear of their properties to move bins out for collection. There are 9 No. bins involved, to be moved out down a narrow fenced pathway to the unadopted road. Have they been consulted? How will their rights be guaranteed?
6. Access to the property would require disabled facilities, including a ramp to the front door. It is difficult to see how this would be achieved given the tight spacing of the access path and single parking space.

Summary

We acknowledge that the application is Outline, with all matters reserved, to establish the principle of residential development on the site. However, we are of the firm opinion that the confined site is entirely unsuitable for residential development, and specifically for the proposed bungalow, due to the impacts on surrounding residents and the already difficult parking problems.

There is simply inadequate space for a residential unit, the necessary private amenity space and off-road parking.

The application should be refused.

Yours faithfully,

Helen Maddocks