

Application Reference: APP/B3438/W/24/3345115

Site Address: 2 Breach Road, Brown Edge, Staffordshire, ST6 8QG

Comments on third party correspondence in email dated 20/08/2024

Grey Text - Third Party Correspondence

Black Italic Text – Comments/ Responses – Dated 29/08/2024

- ‘There is no possible way you can physically fit a bungalow on this area of land’

Response:

- *The proposal for the bungalow achieves the minimum National Space Standards for a 2 bed/ 3 person dwelling (61m² for a 1 storey dwelling) , plus the inclusion of external amenity space, and 2 No. parking spaces.*
- *The parking spaces are not a requirement to NSS, but have been provided to keep cars at the residence away from street parking*

- ‘This area of over grown land is abundant to wildlife’
- ‘The area is home to numerous at risk animals, for example hedgehogs’
- ‘I and others have seen bats and hedgehogs living in the plot of land. Bats are a protected species and as I’m am aware you cant build on land that has bats existing on it’

Response:

- *The land is a privately owned plot of land which was a former lawn within the curtilage of No.2 Breach Road (visible on historic Google maps). The land has become overgrown and could be cut back without development commencing.*
- *The planning authority did not require an ecology report to be carried out and there is no proven evidence of protected wildlife on the site.*
- *Whilst bats do have legal protection, the presence of bats does not mean that development cannot go ahead. The planning authority has duties to ensure that bats are protected, and any relevant licences would need to be obtained by the contractor if bats are discovered during works.*
- *As part of the planning conditions, the Client would be happy to have an ecology survey carried out, and if any bats were found, adequate mitigation measures put in place prior to development.*

- ‘There also used to be a large protected tree on this plot, that was unlawfully cut down’
- ‘I will also mention the magnificent tree that was wrongfully cut down on this plot, in a bid to get planning granted’

Response:

- *The tree was felled over 10 years ago and it is not relevant to this planning application.*

- *The applicant wishes to note that the tree mentioned in comment(s) was not protected (TPO or otherwise). The applicant notified the Council of the tree being diseased and of intent that it was to be felled. The tree was removed safely by a professional tree surgeon.*

- 'A bungalow will not fit in with the other nearby houses and will look very out of place and crammed in.'
- Response:*
 - *There is a very varied mix of typology within the area, with no set precedent of scale, size or materiality of the architecture.*
 - *The proposal has been designed to be simple and sensitive, whilst adding to the range of typologies within the local area*

- 'The construction of this bungalow will have effects on residents and pedestrians in the area'
- 'There will be young children at the property and heavy machinery poses a serious risk to their health. As well as this, it will cause obstructions to the drive way and road entering the property'
- 'My children wouldn't be able to leave my front door, due to machinery that will be used, and van/ lorries coming and going from the building development'
- Response:*
 - *Statutory health and safety requirements must be followed for all construction activities. This is not relevant to a planning decision.*

- 'The road next to the plot is already known to be very dangerous road for young people and those who live on the village and adding another property here would only increase the traffic driving along the main road and turning into Breach Road'
- Response:*
 - *During the design of the proposal, local concerns regarding the safety of the junction were taken into account. The proposed footprint of the house has been designed so that it steps back and away from the corner junction in response to the visibility splay.*
 - *A visibility splay drawing was produced as part of the application to demonstrate that the bungalow line does not encroach onto the recommended visibility splays to the junction of Breach Road and Leek Road.*
 - *A consultation response was received from SCC Highways during the application process, noting that there are no objections on Highway grounds subject to 4 recommended conditions.*
 - *The recommended conditions would be met.*
 - *One of these conditions requires the widening of the footpath on Leek Road to a minimum of 1.75m, prior to construction. This would improve the safety of this section (and general accessibility on the pavement, improving pedestrian access).*

- 'The path that runs alongside the plot, is not adequate for those with pushchairs or wheelchairs to safely pass along, not to mention when there is construction traffic here'
- 'Also the footpath will be restricted, as it is very narrow at the minute and this would create a danger to life as nobody would be able to walk on it, and so would be walking into the road'

Response:

- *As noted above, one of the SCC Highways conditions requires the widening of the footpath on Leek Road to a minimum of 1.75m, prior to construction. This would improve the safety of this section and address those concerns about the path.*
- *As above, the proposals provide a significant increase in footpath width, therefore improving the existing condition.*

- 'The house itself creates a breach of my privacy as it is extremely close and the windows will only be separated by a fence.'
- 'Building a bungalow where you are planning will mean that I will be looking into the property and so will the homeowners if allowed to proceed'

Response:

- *The proposal includes a single small window that faces adjacent onto the property at No. 2, this will be frosted glazing as it is a bathroom (as noted on the proposed drawing), and therefore will omit any privacy concerns. This could be conditioned.*
- *A fence is proposed on the boundary between this window and the neighbouring property which will block line of sight.*
- *Neither house will therefore be able to look inside another property.*

- 'The bungalow would impede my drive and I wouldn't be able to gain access to my own property if this is allowed to go through'

Response:

- *There was previously no access drive to the house in question, the Applicant added an access driveway when the property boundary was split into two.*
- *The driveway would remain a shared access drive. As shared access, it would be required to remain clear during construction.*

- 'My concern is that if you allow the planning permission to go through, the owner would not stick to what was approved and actually do as he pleases'

Response:

- *This is an unfair comment, and an unreasonable assumption to make.*
- *Planning laws are statutory and are there to protect the surrounding environment and decisions are conditioned/ enforceable.*
- *This proposal has tried carefully to address local concerns – providing widened pavements and improved visibility to the junction.*