

12 Sandon Close,
Cresswell,
Stoke on Trent,
Staffordshire,
ST11 9RL.

21st February 2018

Dear Miss Simpkin,

PLANNING APPLICATION No. **SMD/2017/0722 - Approval of Reserved matters following outline permission SMD/2014/0576 – Blythe Business Park**

I have examined the information provided in respect of this planning application, and I am personally familiar with the sites and the local area.

I WISH TO REGISTER THE STRONGEST POSSIBLE OBJECTION TO THIS PROPOSAL.

My house is located adjacent to the field where the houses are proposed, and I am extremely concerned if any excavations start to take place due to the unknown aspects of previous deposition of toxic waste at and around the Blythe park site.

17001-103c General Arrangement Drawing

The proposed roundabout drawing does not detail the position of the existing houses on Cresswell Lane so we are unable to fully consider the likely impact on residents living on Cresswell lane. I request that a new drawing needs to be presented to residents at a review meeting for this purpose?

The existing entrance for Blythe Business Park should continue to be used and is totally adequate for any future site use and a new entrance is totally unacceptable and would create unnecessary disruption / noise / visual impact and a health and safety risk to the residents of this hamlet.

The original planning application (SMD/2014/0576) was approved on the basis that the following highways works must be completed prior to any on-site construction:

1. a roundabout between Cresswell Lane and Uttoxeter Road
2. A roundabout on Cresswell Lane at the proposed site entrance
3. Improvements / traffic calming to the narrow pinch point on Cresswell Lane above the Isaac Walton public house.

This application makes no reference to 1 and 3 above, where are the proposals for the Uttoxeter Road roundabout and the traffic calming / safety measure on Cresswell Lane that were stipulated as part of the approval for the initial planning permission?

I draw your attention to this very issue, in an email from you to Councillor Trigger (dated 22/06/16 @12:01):

Following our conversation today, I refer you to the approved plans in relation to the above:

- 120314-04 Rev C – Suggested Roundabout Arrangement (attached as requested)
- 120314-06 Rev A– Cresswell Road Footway and Localised Highway Widening

- 120314-08 Rev B – Suggested Roundabout Arrangement
- 120314-09 - Swept Path Analysis Fire Tender - Emergency Access
- A-L-0001 Rev A – Land Use Parameter Drawing
- A-L-0003 Rev A – Access and Movement Parameter Drawing

And further conditions 10 and 11:

10. The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until details of the access arrangements indicated on drawing no. 120314-04 rev C (including alterations to the existing access and provision of bus stops) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These shall incorporate further two-dimensional and three dimensional revisions as recommended by subsequent Safety Audits. These access arrangements shall be constructed in accordance with the approved plans prior to first occupation of any part of the development.

Reason:- In the interests of highway safety.

11. The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until details of the off site highway works at the junction of Cresswell Lane and Uttoxeter Road indicated on drawing no. 120314-08 rev B and footway works indicated on drawing no. 120314-06 rev A have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority which shall incorporate further two-dimensional and three dimensional revisions as recommended by subsequent Safety Audits. These off site highway works shall be constructed in accordance with the approved plans prior to the first occupation of any part of the development.

Reason:- In the interests of highway safety.

Unless all of the above requirements are included as stipulated as part of granting approval for the outline planning permission (SMD/2014/0576), then this application MUST be rejected.

This application makes no reference to the construction of 168 new houses? Does this mean that the planning application for the houses has been withdrawn? If so, this fundamentally changes the original planning approval and provides further grounds for rejection.

PRELIMINARY PHASE I AND II GEO-ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT – Wardell Armstrong May 2017

Table 1 – Summary of Intrusive Ground Investigation, states:

Human Health - Exceedances of dibenzo(ah)anthracene (TP26) and lead and cadmium (TP10) were identified within the western development area, both within made ground deposits

The presence of dibenzo (ah) anthracene is described as a carcinogen, suspected of causing genetic defects and being hazardous to the aquatic environment, yet other than in the above table I do not believe is mentioned again in the Wardell Armstrong (WA) report?

The WA report (3.14) recommends that an asbestos survey should be undertaken for the dance studio building. Has this now been carried out?

Does an asbestos survey need to be undertaken across the whole site, given that the developer wishes to construct a new road across the current field, next to the dance studio building and then across the existing business park site which contains numerous old buildings and made up ground that could previously have been used to bury hazardous waste materials?

Table 4 makes reference to SEVEN landfill sites around the site.

- One landfill site, 10m away containing 'unknown' waste types,
- One landfill site 0 meters away, containing 'unknown' waste type
- One landfill site containing **industrial, commercial, special waste and liquid sludge.**
- Are there any records of what the special waste consists of?

How can anyone be categorically sure that there are no other unmarked landfill sites within the and around the existing site and the proposed development areas? There is a high risk that any excavation work could disturb old unknown waste burial areas.

Indeed because of the unknown makeup of the ground and the possibility for other uncontrolled waste burial sites throughout the site, I would like to request that further ground samples / monitoring be carried out along the proposed access route at suitable intervals as recommended by an independent environmental consultant appointed by SMDC to represent the interests and health and safety of Cresswell residents and any persons on site.

The WA report (5.11) highlights that monitoring results were communicated to the EA and SMDC and that you deemed the site remediation work had been completed satisfactorily. Surely from a health and safety perspective, the safest option for the residents of Cresswell is that the green field areas and known contaminated areas of the site remain undisturbed.

The WA report (7.5) states

The western area has had development within its north eastern corner, with a building constructed in the 1980s (now used as a dance studio) with an area of hardstanding for the storage of materials and parking. A tank with some small associated structures was also recorded on historical maps in the south east corner, the contents of the tank are unknown.

The WA report (7.6) states

*In-between the two development areas and along the route of the interconnecting roadway is Blythe Business Park, which has been historically active. Blythe Colour works manufactured a range of colour products for various purposes, primarily for the ceramics industry. They used a range of **harmful and radioactive materials which is thought to have included heavy/toxic metals (arsenic, boron, cadmium, lead, antimony, chromium, nickel and cobalt), uranium oxide, turpentine oil and naphtha (solvents).***

The WA report (7.7) states

*During the war, it is known that the US Army used **tetrachloride's (e.g. tetrachloroethene and tetrachloroethane)** as a dry-cleaning chemical/solvent for chemical impregnation of clothing to provide protection against chemical attack. This was undertaken within the site of Blythe Colour Works.*

The WA report (7.8) states

Materials associated with the above were deposited within the landfill situated in between the two areas.

The WA report (7.12) states

Humans may be exposed to contamination via: ingestion of soil; ingestion of indoor dust/fibres; dermal contact with soil; dermal contact with indoor dust/fibres; ingestion of vegetables grown on site; ingestion of soil on vegetables growing on site; inhalation of fugitive soil dust/fibres; inhalation of fugitive indoor dust/fibres; inhalation of vapours

outdoors or inhalation of vapours indoors. These pathways are considered viable for both construction workers and future site users. However, it is expected that construction workers will be equipped with appropriate PPE'.

The above serves to highlight the potential risk of exposure to harmful pathogens. Is it not also conceivable that residents / members of the public are at risk from exposure to harmful substances if construction activities commence and harmful fibres / pathogens are released due to disturbance particularly during dry windy / dusty periods?

The WA report (7.13) states

Contaminants contained within near surface soils can be leached and transmitted to groundwater via percolation. They may also reach surface water bodies via overland flow and/or through flows/shallow groundwater flow..... The nearest surface water feature is the River Blithe, therefore the transmission of contamination from the site to surface water bodies via overland flow is considered low to moderate

Being as the River Blithe and Fulford Brook are both located adjacent / within the proposed development areas and the fields are part of the flood plain, I fail to understand how contamination via overland flow can be considered 'low to moderate'?

I would expect that stringent water monitoring of the River Blithe and Fulford Brook will be required and we as residents will be discussing this with the Environment Agency as soon as possible. Any disturbance of the ground at and around the site, especially when it then rains, could result in pollution to the groundwater, River Blithe and Fulford Brook, not forgetting the detrimental impact on the local wildlife.

The WA report (7.14) states

Ground gas/vapours may accumulate in enclosed spaces following migration through permeable strata. Again, given that permeability of the drift geology is expected to be moderate to high, there is a high potential that gas could migrate.

This highlights the requirement for landfill gas monitoring around the perimeters of known closed landfill sites. If there is currently little / no landfill gas then this indicates that the waste buried is unlikely to be putrescible waste such as household waste, which creates methane. Is the requirement for landfill gas monitoring currently being initiated and if not what plans are in place to introduce it?

IF this proposal is approved then part of the mandatory requirements must be for gas monitoring around the development areas and around known landfill sites, so that should construction activities disturb any unknown / old landfill sites, monitoring ensure that any methane gas migration is identified early and containment measures established as a priority. Indeed gas containment measures must be put in place as soon as possible.

How can we be categorically clear that hazardous waste / materials are not buried elsewhere around the site and that any construction work will not result in potential health and safety risks to residents of Cresswell?

Table 12 is a risk summary table for different areas of the site, some of which, no-one knows what waste is buried there, so how can a risk be described as 'moderate'?

Surely any risk assessment can only be determined based on more detailed information established as a result of further site investigation works?

The WA report states that a site investigation was carried out at the site between 21 February and 3 March 2017. The investigation locations are shown on Drawing No.ST15807 003.

The drawing showing the location of all the sampling points should be available for inspection as part of this planning evaluation process. This drawing is not available on the planning portal whilst I was reviewing the application submissions on 18/02/18, therefore this planning process is flawed and should be rejected?

Can you advise if SMDC was present during the site monitoring / sampling activities undertaken by WA, or if you were consulted prior to any monitoring taking place?

Did you recommend to the applicant what monitoring you required?

Table 19 and Table 20 outlines the result for the soil sampling for the site. Has someone at SMDC with suitable environmental qualifications and knowledge reviewed these results and deemed them to be satisfactory?

Table 21 and Table 22 outlines the result for the groundwater sampling of the site. . Has someone at SMDC with suitable environmental qualifications and knowledge reviewed these results and deems them to be satisfactory?

The WA report (9.33) states

The results of the groundwater monitoring show that groundwater level at the site is relatively high and the groundwater is at a depth whereby soakaways may not be viable. Other drainage options should be utilised, with final designs and suitable options should be undertaken and reviewed by a qualified drainage specialist.

The WA report (9.42) states

Chemical exceedances within soil samples tested were only recorded within made ground at TP26 and TP10 on the western area.

The WA report (9.44) states

*With regards to water contamination results, **exceedances were found at all locations tested. For the western area, no identifiable source of these contaminants was determined.** Therefore, the levels found are likely to be associated with background levels found locally.*

The above findings of WA suggest to me that that further monitoring is required to be undertaken before any construction is permitted to take place.

The WA report (11.10) states

Shallow groundwater has been identified and therefore it is probable that excavations may require dewatering. In addition, due to the predominantly granular soils, it is likely that excavations would collapse, particularly if left open for any extended period of time, and therefore would require support.

Surely this makes the site unsuitable for development?

Blythe Vale – Planning Permission Granted

Residents are aware that the planning application for Blythe Vale (St Modwen's) has been approved by SMDC. This development is in a much better location for development being as it is located on a Class A road / dual carriage way, with excellent links to the A50, Stoke on Trent and Derby, not to mention access to amenities / retail facilities at nearby Meir Park. In terms of an options appraisal / or a 'sequential test' (which incidentally the applicants for Blythe Park never submitted despite this being raised as a concern by you as planning officer), the Blythe Vale proposal is a much better proposal, in terms of location and site when compared with the ludicrous Blythe Park proposal, which is accessed via a narrow dangerous B-road, located on an unsuitable site with no local access to amenities such as schools, shops and health services.

Economic Development Statement.

This statement outlines that 10 new jobs would be created and 105,674 sq ft of employment space. There are existing areas of the current business park site that could be re-developed / re-used rather than to build on a green belt site. The proposed new site access is totally unnecessary. To put the hamlet of Cresswell through this unnecessary anguish to provide x10 jobs is absolutely ludicrous.

In granting outline planning permission for application (SMD/2014/0576) that unless all of the stipulated requirements are complied with (as referenced above), then this application MUST be rejected.

This Planning Process – SMDC Planning Portal and Availability of Planning Application Documents

During my evaluation of this planning application, the availability of planning application documents has been highly irregular.

- Wednesday 14/02 planning documents showing on the planning portal x61
- Saturday 17/02 SMDC planning portal was unavailable in the afternoon and evening.
- Sunday morning planning portal became accessible again, but only x24 documents available (this excludes public comments documents listed) and documents listed using different titles than previously used on 14/02?
- **What has happened to the other x37 documents that were available on 14/02?**
- Tuesday 20/02 only x24 planning documents available for inspection
- Wednesday 21/02 now x26 documents available for inspection?
- The WA Phase I and II Environmental report (which I evaluated above) I cannot now see listed on your planning portal (Wed 21/02@ 21:07) Where is it?

This whole planning evaluation process is totally flawed and highly irregular. How can residents and other interested parties carry out any objective evaluation of all relevant documents when your planning portal is totally unstable, documents are available one minute, but not the next and the titles of documents appear to be constantly changing. How can anyone have any trust in this process?

I request you to take my views, objections and suggestions are taken into consideration in the determining of this application. I demand that this planning application be rejected and that this flawed process be stopped as soon as possible.

Yours sincerely,

N J Holdcroft.

To:

Rachel Simpkin
Senior Planning Officer
Development Management

Staffordshire Moorlands District Council,
Moorlands House,
Stockwell street,
Leek,
ST13 6HQ