

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

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

Application Type: FULL

Applicant: Mr P Hammond,
 Mr David Byatt
 128, Churnet Valley Road,
 Kingsley Holt,
 ST10 2BQ

Officer: David Plant

Our Reference: SMD20210793

District Reference: SMD/2021/0793

Date Received: 23-Dec-2021

Date Responded: 12-Jan-2022

Particulars of Development:

Proposed Demolition of existing bungalow & development of 3 Bungalows

Location of Development:

128, Churnet Valley Road, STOKE-ON-TRENT, ST10 2BQ

Recommendation Summary: Refusal

Site Visit Conducted on: 05-Jan-2022

1. Application fails to demonstrate adequate parking can be provided within the curtilage.
2. Application fails to demonstrate that adequate visibility is to be provided at each access point or the effect on the existing hedge.
3. Application fails to fully consider pedestrian requirements.
4. Application fails to demonstrate means to prevent surface water flowing onto the highway.

REASONS

In conflict with NPPF Paragraph 111; in conflict with SMDC Local Plan Policy DC1, T1 and T2; contrary to the interests of highway safety.

IMPORTANT INFORMATIVE TO BE INCLUDED ON DECISION NOTICE

This recommendation of refusal will not prejudice consideration of a further application at a later date when:

- adequate turning for vehicles within the curtilage;
- visibility splays at each access point;
- improved facilities for pedestrians;
- facilities to prevent surface water flowing onto the highway;
- location of existing access point;

- proposed access points at kerblines specifying width at kerblines;
are included in the application.

NOTES TO PLANNING OFFICER

Submitted drawing 5705-002 A shows vehicles in a parking area parallel to the carriageway. No dimensions are stated, but the widths of the parking areas scale at approx 5m each, which is slightly greater than the minimum width for two parking bays (4.8m). Again, no dimensions are stated but total depths (including the access) of the parking areas scale at 7.8m for northern plot and central plot and 8.4m for the southern plot. This allows 3m, 3m and 3.6m to the rear of each bay respectively. In order for a vehicle to reverse from a standard size parking bay, a clear distance of 6m is required to the rear of each bay to allow manoeuvring. If this is not available, width of the bays may be increased. As there is such a relatively small area to the rear of each space, width would need to be increased significantly with the consequent greater requirement for surfacing. Development appears cramped.

Visibility splays are not shown at accesses. There is a hedge on the frontage which is not shown on existing or proposed drawings. Visibility splays appropriate to the speed limit are required and should be shown. Hedge should also be shown and proposals for this clarified.

Footway on the frontage is narrower than that to the north and south of the frontage. To improve facilities for pedestrians, encourage alternative modes of transport and comply with policy, footway on the frontage should be widened to min 1.8m wide under highway works agreement.

Existing access point is not shown on the drawings. Width of proposed access point at the kerblines is not shown. Width of access is not stated. Relationship between existing and proposed access point is not clear.