From:	planningcomments@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk
To:	Planning Comments (SMDC)
Subject:	Comment Received from Public Access
Date:	29 June 2017 22:55:40

Application Reference No. : SMD/2017/0145
Site Address: Land South East Of Lodge Farmhouse BASFORD HALL ROAD BASFORD LEEK STAFFORDSHIRE
Comments by: Damian Pearson
From:
New House Farm
Tompkin Lane
Stanley
Stoke On Trent
Staffordshire
ST99LY
Phone:
Email:
Submission: Objection
Comments: From the actual application SMD/2017/0145 I question the following:

From the Proposed & Location Plan. Why does the plan view not show or detail my residential property¿s location at Springfields? especially as it is so close to this new development and the applicant is well aware of its existence.

In the application, section 3, it states the building work is not complete. What further development is going to take place here?

Contrary to section 24, the incinerator can be seen from the roadway, from the bridge outside Mosslea Mill farm and onwards.

Regards the Planning & Heritage Statement:

3.7 states to ¿not affect the rural character or environmental quality of the area¿. I am concerned about the emissions from the chimney stack. My boundary is just 40 meters East and the property a further 40meters on. Our position is also approximately 30 meters lower down the hillside, meaning both fugitive and noise emissions will affect the enjoyment of our property. For this reason I question as to why Mr Montcreif chose to position the incinerator so close to his/our boundary, thus affecting the lawful enjoyment of others and their property. He could well have either upgraded or added to the capacity of his existing incinerator on his Basford estate, or positioned the incinerator well within his boundary and not the 30meters or so that this incinerator has been placed so close to the property of others. A matter of fact is that the increasing of an existing incinerator would have been far more efficient than the introducing of a second incinerator (a larger unit being more efficient than two smaller units).

5.8 states ¿wood sourced from woodland situated within the Basford estate¿ My understanding is that this is not correct at all and Mr Montcrief is receiving the wood pellets from the Pointons estate, be that consall wood, the Offal factory and numerous other premises owned, operated or run by the Pointons. This is then subsequently thoroughly dried utilising heat provided by the offal factory prior to actual transport to Mr Montcrief¿s Basford estate. This hardly seems environmentally friendly, low carbon or renewable.

Site position 2.1 fig 1, shows the building from its lowest side. The tallest side of the building or the view from the road has surprisingly been omitted.

5.6 also does not state my property being affected by its development.

6.1 continues the theme of not affecting ¿others amenity¿, as per 5.6 above.

Of the two areas fed by this incinerator, the Bathhouses are far more central to Mr Montcriefs estate and would therefore have not effected the lawful enjoyment of others whatsoever. The Bathhouse area having an existing tarmacked access road running directly to it and its position sat down in the valley being completely out of the eyesight of others.

I also fear that the newly added access track & hardstanding above my ground will now bring increased uncontrolled runoff and hence erosion through my property. As the above explanation of distances shows, this is a very steep bank that he has chosen to position his incinerator on. I also fear continued development of this site now, because if left to remain then a precedent will have been set for any future additions to Mr Montcrief ¿s estate in this area, and so close to my boundary/property.

The actual details of the incinerator, its alleged efficiency, its fallout from its chimney over ¿others¿ property and any waste produced i.e. ash etc¿ seem to have been completely omitted from this application. It actually uses the premise that all Biomass is efficient and therefore it should be allowed. Also that all old listed properties are inefficient and hence planning should also therefore be allowed.

The fact that erection of this development without stopping and insisting that PP was required before proceeding further actually beggars belief.

I question as to why when concerns of all the above were raised with SMDC Planning at the actual time that the unannounced excavation works started on this incinerator and that its development was allowed to proceed? This being excavation and erection of a non-agricultural building on a greenfield, greenbelt site in the close vicinity of Listed buildings sat within an estate that purports to be a Park (part of Staffordshire Gardens & Parks trust).

My conclusion is that this building should not be allowed to remain in its current position and that the applicant should have applied for prior Planning Permission as it does actually affect the lawful use of a property owned other than by the applicant. Other methods of heating could have been utilised, including increasing an existing facilities capacity.

The erection of this unit in its current position seems to be purely for financial gain and to antagonise an existing, seemingly invisible, local resident.