DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2018/0539 **Valid 04/12/2018**	**401 CHEADLE ROAD** **CHEDDLETON**	**NEW VEHICLE ACCESS CROSSING TO ALLOW OFF ROAD PARKING AT EXISTING HOUSE** **(FULL - MINOR)**

MAIN ISSUES

- Highways
- Design

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

Two storey semi-detached dwelling that fronts Cheadle Road, the A520 in Cheddleton. There is a dropped kerb to the south of the dwelling providing an access to a brick paved parking and turning area to the side of the dwelling. Before the applicant carried out work to open his frontage, that existing access passed between gate posts and there was a brick wall that carried on across the front of the applicant's dwelling and its adjoining neighbour – that wall has since been demolished.

All of the neighbouring properties and fields opposite, in this semi rural location, have strong traditional boundary features fronting the highway – either dry stone wall, brick wall or hedgerow. This generally means that parking is set back from the highway or to some extent screened from view.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks planning permission to construct a new and altered means of vehicular access to the A520 including the provision of a dropped kerb and footway across the whole 16metre width of the property frontage.

Some development, requiring planning permission, has already been carried out to construct a raised and level surface directly to the front of the dwelling's principal elevation to provide a new parking space between the dwelling's front elevation and the edge of the highway. The raised levels were necessary to provide a flat surface that ran through at the same level as the footway edge.

It is said that existing parking and turning space to the south of the house would be occupied by other vehicles, including a works van, and that they would obstruct the movement of a turning vehilce and prevent it from entering and leaving the new parking space in a forward gear. It is necessary therefore to drop the kerb and footway to the front of this new space so that a vechile could either reverse straight on or off the highway.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES
Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Adopted 2014)
S01 Spatial Objectives
SS1 Development Principles
SS1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
DC1 Design Considerations
DC3 Character and appearance of landscape
T1 Development and Sustainable Transport

National Planning Policy Framework
Paragraph(s) 1-14
Section(s) 9 & 12

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS
SMD/1985/0643 Extension to form porch and bay APPROVED

CONSULTATIONS
Publicity
Site Notice expiry date: 07/01/2019
Neighbour consultation period ends: 27/12/2018
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments
An objection has been received from the adjoining neighbour. The following points raised:

No retaining wall between the two properties and only a Sleeper Edging, causing possible issues in ground retention as well as flood water encroachment onto our lower pathways/garden.

An “extended access” would make a substantial parking area for numerous vehicles across the width of the property joining up with an existing Vehicle Access.

Cheddleton Parish Council

Object. The raised surface to the front of the dwelling may potentially cause run off onto the highway, there are no surface water drainage details. Concerned about the number and type of vehicles that would use the access and new parking areas.

Staffordshire County Council Highways

Object. Lack of detail and information provided with the application. Failure to clearly show the extent and width of the proposed highway crossing; demonstrate how the new parking space would be drained and surfaced; and clarify the turning arrangements that would allow a vehcile using that space to enter and leave the property in a forward gear.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The development would take place within the village settlement boundary where residential development can be acceptable. The NPPF, revised July 2018, promotes sustainable development making it clear that there should be a presumption in favour. An overarching objective of sustainable development is to achieve good design, and this is reiterated at section 12 which is dedicated to 'achieving well designed places' – preserving assets and quality environments for future generations. The Council's development plan policies in the adopted Core Strategy and the Emerging Local Plan accord with the NPPF in those respects (SS1a and DC1). Essentially, good design is not divisible from good planning that achieves sustainable development. There would be a presumption in favour therefore, of development that is designed well and does not harm amenity, highway safety and the character and appearance of the area.

Design

The proposed development in this case does not represent good and well considered design that would relate well to the proportions and arrangements of the dwelling, its plot, and the character and appearance of the area.

The proposal is instead apparently motivated by a desire to maximise parking provision within the plot by levelling and surfacing parts of the curtilage that don't naturally lend themselves to parking and opening the whole of the frontage up to the highway.

This would result in a vehicle being parked in an exposed and prominent position concealing part of the dwelling's front elevation and architecture. Most of the properties in this locality have strong frontages with traditional boundary feature and the architecture of cottage frontages contributing to the quality of the character and appearance of the area, parking is generally set back from the roadside and largely concealed or screened. This proposal has resulted in the removal of traditional boundary feature, partial concealment of the cottages frontage and the prominence of a motor vehicle which has a negative affect on character and appearance. The proposals would create a car dominated frontage which is generally regarded to be poor in urban design terms.

Proposal therefore contrary to policy DC1 and DC3 of the SMDC Core Strategy and Section 12 of the NPPF. .

Highway Safety

The Highway Authority has objected to the development. They criticised the application because it provided only limited information which prevented them from clarifying the extent of the harm. However, they suspected and were concerned that the new parking space would not be properly drained and could cause run off onto the highway; and that it would provide additional parking space for a vehicle that would not be able to turn and enter and leave the property in a forward gear.

In the spirit of a positive approach to problem solving, promoted at paragraph 38 of the NPPF, the matters were discussed with the applicant during the application process. However, he only clarified and confirmed that the Highway Authority were right to be concerend. Clearly, the proposal to drop the footway and kerb to the front of the new parking space and across the frontage demomstrates a clear intention to either reverse a vehicle straight onto or off the A520, necessary because other vehicles parked on the pre existing parking area would prevent a vehicle on the additional parking space from turning. This would present a significant danger to all users of the highway and footpath. The development would be contrary to the policy approach set out at Paragraph 108 of the National Planning Policy Framwework; and polcies DC1 and T1 of the Staffs Moorlands Core Strategy Policies DC1 and T1.

Other Matters

Essentially the flow of water between two adjoining properties and the stability of retaining structures is a private or civil matter between land owners. If that flow of water is increased and a flooding issue is exacerbated as a result of development it might be necessary to mitigate in respect of the issue with additional or alternative drainage arrangements. However, in this case the development is considered in any event unacceptable by reason of other harms.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The development would be harmful to highway safety and the character and appearance of the area.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : REFUSE

Case Officer: Laura Barnes
Recommendation Date: 29th January 2019

X B.J. Haywood

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council