

## **Burnett, James**

---

**From:** Planning (SMDC)  
**Subject:** FW: Comment Received from Public Access

-----Original Message-----

From: planning@staffmoorlands.gov.uk [mailto:planning@staffmoorlands.gov.uk]  
Sent: Thursday, October 13, 2016 1:21 PM  
To: Planning (SMDC)  
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access

Application Reference No. : SMD/2016/0580 Site Address: Land to the west of 10 Cheadle Road Cheddleton  
Staffordshire ST13 7HL Leek Comments by: Mrs Sheila Statham

From:

Churnet Hall  
Cheadle Road  
Cheddleton

Staffordshire  
ST13 7HL

Phone: 01538 361506

Email: sheilaplant@hotmail.co.uk

Submission: Objection

Comments: I would, once again, like to formally object to the above planning application.

I find it difficult to understand that the applicant and his agents seem to have a problem with "word blindness"... As they obviously missed something in the Planning Departments previous refusal I will re quote the pertinent part....

### **REFUSAL**

1. The proposed development of 5 houses on a greenfield undeveloped parcel of land will result in loss of openness, constituting an inappropriate form of development which, by definition, is harmful to green belt. No special circumstances have been demonstrated to clearly outweigh the harm caused by reason of inappropriateness and is contrary to Paras 87, 88 and 89 of NPPF.

2. The development would erode the rural nature of the site and harm the open rural character of this part of the Cheddleton Conservation area as well as the setting of Caldon Canal Conservation area and the group of Grade 2 buildings associated with the Flint Mill causing substantial harm to these heritage assets contrary to Para 1321133 of the NPPF and Policy DCZ of the Core Strategy.

3. The site lies within an area identified in the Historic Environment Character Assessment Staffs Moorland 2010 (Heca) as the Cheddleton, Wetley and Werrington character area CWWHECZ6. The proposal would have a detrimental suburbanising effect on the landscape which is acknowledged as making an important contribution to the history and aesthetics of the Staffordshire Moorlands landscape contrary to Policy DC3 of the Core Strategy.

### **INFORMATIVES**

THE PRINCIPLE OF THE DEVELOPMENT IS UNSUSTAINABLE AND DID NOT CONFORM WITH THE PROVISIONS OF THE NPPF. IT IS CONSIDERED THAT THE APPLICANT IS UNABLE TO OVERCOME SUCH PRINCIPLE CONCERNS AND THUS NO AMENDMENTS TO THE APPLICATION WERE REQUESTED (the capitol letters were my amendment to the statement for ease of reading as I can only assume that this statement was not noticed by the applicant previously)

I re-printed the above as the applicant and his advisors state in their new application that it responds to "case officers recommendations and reasons for refusal to provide a revised low key development which will have less of an impact". I'm sorry...but either they seriously need glasses or they think that people only read the current paperwork and don't refer to previous papers and statements.

No amount of tinkering with design and layout makes an acceptable difference to the application.

Two other points are annoying. The applicants statements never make any mention about the natural spring on the site which is the reason that the lower area has rushes growing. They also never mention the Public Footpath across the land, in fact, on the paperwork a question asks particularly about whether a footpath exists or will need re-routing etc....and they tick NO.

Also,they state "...the gradient of the part of the site which falls within the development boundary is relatively low..." This is mis-leading as the gradient south of the site is far from low and, more worryingly, the gradient north of the proposed development is the steep bank between the site and the canal which is definitely not a low gradient. This bank is not stable and has already collapsed once before resulting in major repairs. With regard to improving screening around the site. As the present tree cover is deciduous and in poor condition the only way to do that would be the planting of substantial evergreens which would not blend well with the natural woodland appearance of the canal and heritage area. The pine trees forming part of the boundary to open farmland were originally planted to be cut for sale as christmas trees but were left too long. They are now in the process of being removed gradually by the owner...thankfully.

I sincerely hope that the applicant does not intend continuously submitting applications with maybe reductions in the number of houses in the hope that objections will cease. He should remember that some years ago the previous owner of the land failed to get planning permission for even one house. It was felt then that this piece of land should be protected and people still feel that way now and always will. Thankfully we appear to have caring officials in charge who do their best to protect sites such as these. We all appreciate that a large number of new houses need to be built but the tiny number this site could accomodate and the risks associated with any development on unstable land would far outweigh the gain. As a Parish Councillor he should think the same way instead of trying to make a quick profit.

Thank you for your kind attention in this matter

Yours faithfully

Sheila Statham