From: planning@staffmoorlands.gov.uk
To: Planning (SMDC)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access
Date: 06 January 2017 16:34:52

Application Reference No. : SMD/2016/0530
Site Address: 168 Ostlers Lane Cheddleton Staffordshire ST13 7DQ Leek
Comments by: Miss E Holland
From:

164
Ostlers Lane
Cheddleton
Leek
Staffordshire
ST13 7DQ

Phone:
Email:
Submission: Neither
Comments: I do not wish to object to the application for development, I do want to air my concerns and comments regarding the development as there are a number of errors in the application which I wanted to put on record and ensure that the Authority's decision on the development is made based on accurate information.

I understand the 1:200 scale is far more detailed than 1:1250. The Site Plan is not accurately drawn to scale and the Location Plan has not been accurately marked up with locations of the access track and other points of reference.

Both the sketched Site Plan (1:200) and the Location Plan (1:1250) submitted with the application incorrectly refer to the field area the applicant has purchased as ¿168 garden¿ this is green belt field, so should be referred to as ¿proposed garden¿ for the purpose of the application. (The original property/garden curtilage is in line with the Eastern most boundary of the parking area). The application form (section 14) also refers to the sites existing use as garden, this is incorrect, the application form (section 3) is seeking to change the use of Green Belt/Field to parking area, the applicant is seeking to change greenbelt to garden and parking area.

The Site Plan incorrectly refers to the land north of the three properties as ¿164 garden¿.

The Location Plan refers to a ¿drain¿ that serves 164, 166 and 168 this is incorrectly located on the plan, the text on the Location Plan states that the nearest drains to the parking area is 25meters (m) South, this is incorrect. (It is much closer, more detail on drain location given below in General Comments).

The Location Plan has the Access Track marked up as being 5m in width. The Site Plan is marked up with the Access Track as 3m wide. The two plans contradict each other, whilst I appreciate there is a margin of error between the two scales used. The actual width of the access track between the inside of the two stone gateposts at the boundary with the Highway is 3.4m

The Location Plan depicts the parking area to be 5m wide by 4m in depth. Which contradicts the text on the location plan which states the proposed parking area is 6m wide by 6.1m in depth. The Site Plan is marked consistently with the text stating the parking area as 6m x 6.1m. I have not measured the actual parking area to confirm if the stated size is correct, as this is not my property.

The Location Plan shows the Access Track is 25m away from the hedge. The Site Plan contradicts this and incorrectly shows the Access Track is only 6m away from the hedge. I have not measured this distance as this is not my land, but I do not believe it is either 6m nor 25m, so I feel the location of the Access Track has been incorrectly marked on the plans.

The Location Plan shows the Parking Area is 30m away from the hedge, I do not believe this to be correct. This also contradicts the text on the location plan which states the hedge is 25m North of the parking area, another inconsistency.

The Location Plan appears to show the hedge in the surrounding field to be 6m wide, this is incorrect.

The Site Plan incorrectly shows the width of ¿164 garden¿ as 24m wide by 29m deep, (Actual dimensions of land at 164 is 17.5m wide, by 19m deep at narrowest points). The Site Plan measurements contradict the Location Plan. The Location Plan shows the width of the land at 164 as 15m wide, by 19m deep, near enough given a margin for error with the scale 1:1250.

General comments about the application:

I appreciate that the applicant wanted to remove the two vehicles from on street parking to off street and has done so by buying a small section of field adjacent to the garden. Limestoned a section of the boundary where it meets an agricultural access track. Presumably agreed a right of way over this with the land owner and accesses the Highway through what was previously a gated entrance to a field. (Retrospective application). A little more thought could have reduced the impact this has on other people.

I am unsure from the application as to whether there will be any associated landscaping with the development once permission is granted.

There is no surfaced pedestrian access to the parking area. The applicants have to walk over the grass, which has probably been fine over the summer months, but is not be very practical as the weather turns wetter over the winter. So further works are required to make the development practical for use. I therefore have concerns for the combined sewer which serves all three of the terrace properties (164, 166 and 168 the applicants property). On the Site Plan the applicant states ¿there are no drains near the hardcore¿ this is incorrect. The drain is not shown on the Site Plan, with a more detailed scale (1:200). On the Location Plan the applicant refers to a shared drain and marked its location incorrectly on the plan, I appreciate the scale is less detailed, but the drain is not linear. The two plans therefore contradict each other, perhaps an accidental error or the applicant is unaware of the location of the drain. The three terrace properties have a shared sewer which runs at the rear of the three properties from manhole number SJ96518504 in the Highway some 19m to manhole SJ96518502, it then runs at an angle across the field, (approximately in a North, North, West Direction from the rear of 168, so this passes through the proposed garden and is very close to the parking area). I am unsure whether the sewer has been affected by the works that have already taken place, I would also be concerned for the sewer should further landscaping works take place if permission for this development is granted. Whilst I am aware that this would be a civil matter rather than a planning matter I think it is important to note that the plan has inaccurate information on it. I also wanted to use this opportunity to provide accurate information to the applicant hopefully protecting the sewer and preventing future issues.

The Site Plan states that drainage is to the surrounding fields. This impacts on my land. Since the installation of the parking area the land at 164, to the east of the parking area (incorrectly referred to as garden by the applicant on his Site Plan) has become wetter and water logged, as the natural drainage slope of the field has been disrupted by the installation of this development. This is possibly being amplified by run off from the parking area. I will now have to address this at my own expense. Could drainage for the development be linked into the sewer system, it runs through the proposed garden area and very close to the parking area, to prevent run off impacting on other people¿s property?

The outlook from my kitchen door (main door to my property and a stable door to appreciate the view) has changed due to the parking of the vehicles. I totally appreciate I don¿t own the view, but the development has impacted on my view and outlook. As the application seems to relate to changing the use of the entire field plot in the applicant¿s ownership to garden, then the likelihood of erection of associated garden buildings, fencing, planting and lighting is high, this is a concern to me as it would further impact on my view, outlook and enjoyment of my property and land. If the parking area had been sited adjacent to the applicants house, it would

be more beneficial for their own access and convenience, but also not impact on my view from, or enjoyment of my property.

I would like to add that the parking area created is quite small so doesn¿t allow for a turning area. The applicant ¿s household has two vehicles, without the turning space these are either reversed on or off the Highway. Neither is ideal from a road safety point of view.

The two cars currently at the household fit side by side on the parking area, I shouldn¿t imagine access to both sides of the vehicles is possible though due to close proximity to the fence boundaries either side of the plot/parking area. The vehicles are average sized cars, should the applicant change a vehicle, or move out and new residents move in with family cars, the parking will probably not serve the purpose due to its size.

It appears that the space of the plot of land purchased and convenience has dictated the parking area which has been installed, rather than incorporating a well-designed, safe area for vehicles which is in keeping with the property and the countryside.