Form X (i)

Staffordshire County Council
Town and Country Planning Act, 1990
Development Management Procedure Order 2015

To: Staffordshire Moorlands, DCM
Staffordshire Moorlands District Council
Moorlands House
Stockwell Street
Leek
ST13 6HQ

Applicant: MS SAU KUEN TO
THE BOUNDARY HOUSE
CLEWLOWS BANK
BAGNALL
ST9 9LN

Application Type: FULL
Application No: SMD2020/0274
Date Received: 15-JUN-2020
Road No: C187

Officer: David Plant
Date: 03-JUL-2020

Particulars of Development:
PROPOSED NEW ACCESS OF CLEWLOWS BANK (VEHICULAR AND PREDESTRIAN).

Location of Development:
THE BOUNDARY HOUSE, CLEWLOWS BANK,
BAGNALL, ST9 9LN.

Refusal

Recommendations: This application should be refused for the following reasons:-

1 The proposal is for a second access to a single dwelling which is contrary to Staffordshire County Council Highways guidance for Vehicle Access Crossings.

2 The traffic generated by the proposed development would be likely to result in an increase in highway danger due to creation of a second access where it is unnecessary and where it has not been demonstrated that there are grounds for a second access.

3 Conflicting information.

4 The proposal to construct an access in the position indicated on the submitted plan fails to demonstrate the requisite visibility splays can be provided within land under the applicant's control. Also the reduced width of the existng access fails to demonstrtate that adequate visibility splays are provided.

REASONS

ALL In conflict with NPPF paragraph 108; in conflict with SMDC Core Strategy Policy DC1; contrary to the interests of highway safety.

1 In conflict with Staffordshire County Council published guidance on Vehicular Access Crossings.

NOTES TO PLANNING OFFICER

The application states that 'when two cars are parked adjacent to the property these have to reverse out into the road'. However, parking adjacent to the property is the choice of the occupants of the dwelling. There is adequate space to park and turn at least three vehicles if the area in front of the garage were to be used.
Two cars parked directly in front of the dwelling would indeed likely prevent access to the area in front of the garage. However, this would be caused by the choice of how the drivers of the vehicles parked, not by the layout of the parking/turning area. The applicants have the option of parking such that they can use and don't block access to their turning area, thereby avoiding the problem.
It is not appropriate to create an additional access onto the highway to solve a problem of the occupants or their visitors own making.
Reference to google streetview demonstrates how the parking can work (2009 - 2012) and also how a single small vehicle, inappropriately parked, can obstruct access to the bulk of the parking and turning area (2016).

SCC guidance on Vehicle Access Crossings states:
"Only one crossing into a property will be approved. Separate 'in and out' crossings are not normally permitted.
If you require a second access and there is specific justification, please include these details in the relevant section of the application form."

As discussed above, the submitted reasons do not constitute justification.

There is record of an accident close to the property on 12th April 2006. While the accident is strictly outside of the usual time limit, it was a fatal accident. This adds significant weight against the proposal of creating an additional access at a point where a fatal accident occurred particularly when adequate visibility cannot be demonstrated.

The submitted drawing shows existing access of approx 3m width. The actual existing access measures 8.9m

Removal of the front hedge would not provide the requisite visibility splay.

Commissioner for the Built County
on behalf of the County Council
as Highway Authority