Reference SD18-046 SS

SUPPORTING STATEMENT

PROPOSED 2 NO: HOUSES AND GARAGES AT HALL GATE, CHURCH END, FLEET

FOR MR D BARKER

FOR THE REMOVAL OF CONDITION NO: 12 OF PLANNING PERMISSION H05-0905-19

Status Design
2 Edinburgh Walk
Holbeach
Spalding
Lincolnshire
PE12 7AP

Tel: 01406 424343
Fax: 01406 490702
Email: info@status-design.co.uk
Website: www.status-design.co.uk

Supporting Statement

For the Removal of Condition No: 12 from Planning Permission H05-0905-19

Condition No: 12 of Planning Permission H05-0905-19 states that a 1.8m wide footway is to be provided to connect the development to the existing footway network.

For the following reasons, it is proposed that this Condition be removed.:

1) The proposed site is already connected to the existing footpath network as there is a 1.5m wide footpath running the full length on the opposite side of the road to the site. If necessary a suitable drop kerb could be installed directly opposite the site access.
2) The site is within the Conservation for Fleet and it would be out of character to have footpaths in this location on both sides of the road (especially if 1.8m wide) and would not be appropriate for the Conservation Area with the local St Mary Magdalene Church in the background.
3) There is an existing footpath (1.2m wide) on the same side of the road as the site in question and starts from the northern end of the site and finishes to the south of "The Crooked Billet" some 60m (approx) away and then a gap to where the footpath starts again at the junction with Churchgate. So even if we linked up to the existing footpath pedestrians would still have to cross the road at the north end of "The Crooked Billet" it seems therefore this would achieve no more than Item No 1.
4) Looking around the Village of Fleet Church End, the existing footpath network changes to opposite sides of the road on numerous occasions, which means pedestrians have to cross the road in these locations. This again leads me to suggest Item No 1.

5) The existing footpath network consists of varying widths of 0.9m to 1.5m, so it seems unreasonable to request a new 1.8m wide footpath especially in this Conservation Area.

6) A new footpath linking to the footpath to the north would create more pedestrians using this section of footpath which is very close to existing houses and would therefore lead to disturbance to these properties, with people peering in etc.

7) There are existing mature trees along the site frontage and any newly constructed footpath could lead to damaging the roots to these trees with the result of loss of subsequent mature trees.

8) Overall a sensible approach would be to link the site to the footpath on the opposite side of the road with a suitable drop kerb if necessary.