
From: planningcomments@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk
Sent: 11 April 2018 20:34
To: Planning Comments (SMDC)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access

Categories: Blue Category

Application Reference No. : SMD/2018/0188 Site Address: Rock House Farm Town End Road Foxt Staffordshire ST10 2HN Stoke On Trent

Comments by: Pamela StimpsonMrs

From:

The Heights
Foxt
Foxt
Nr Cheadle
Staffordshire
st102hn

Phone:

Email:

Submission: Objection Comments:

The Heights

Foxt CHRONOLOGY ROCK HOUSE FARM

1)Rock House Farm was purchased by Mr and Mrs Douglas Hartley in 1976. At that time the land belonging to Rock House Farm was in agricultural use.

2) My family moved to Foxt in 1978.

3)Mrs Lesley Hartleys hobby was horse riding and in 1986 she set up a arab horse race training yard at Rock House Farm. She took in liveryes and the agricultural land behind the barns which are now converted into holiday lets was used on a daily basis for horse turn out and the sand area was used for the covering of mares as Mrs Hartley stood her stallion at stud.

4) I can confirm that during the period from 1986 to 2002 that the agricultural land behind the barns was used solely for the turn out of horses, Also during this period I had horses in livery with Mrs. Hartley. Starting in 1987 with my daughters gelding.

5)I can also confirm that after Mr. and Mrs Lockwood purchased Rock House Farm they also allowed me use of a stable and the agricultural land behind the barns for turn out of my young racing stallion.

6)In 2003 the Applicants gained planning permission to turn the barns into holiday lets. This permission was granted solely for the barns and the yard area , not for the agricultural land behind the barns.

7)2003/SMD/2002/1113 the applicants applied to remove 3 wooden loose boxes/stables from the car park area to the agricultural land behind the barns. This was granted.

8)07/00004/ful The applicants made an application for damp and maintenance behind barn B. This was granted. On this application Mr. Lockwood states that the land is in agricultural use.

9) In 2017 the applicants applied for removal of condition 3 on the holiday lets for full domestic use. They included in this application the agricultural land behind barn 2 because there was insufficient domestic curtilage. This land had not been included in their original application. Therefore it did not have a change of use.

My objection has always been that there has not been a change of use on the agricultural land behind barn B to allow it to be included in the domestic curtilage. There is evidence in my chronology to confirm that the land had not got recreation and accommodation use for 26 years prior to 2002. The domestic curtilage on this application is clearly different from the original application in 2003. The land marked in red on the plans does not correspond with the land marked on the original application granted in 2003 for the holiday lets. The applicant appears to have broadened the domestic curtilage to include the 3 loose boxes. The loose boxes were granted planning permission in 2003 SMD/2002/1113 for relocation to the agricultural land behind the barns. These have now been included in the land marked red on the plan (ie domestic) use. No planning permission has been applied for or granted to allow these loose boxes to have domestic or business use. On the Rock House Farm web site there is a section called Cedar retreat (hot tubs). Is this amenity located in the loose boxes which do not have business or domestic use permission. I quote from a section on the Rock House Farm web site (hot tubs) "guests receive 1 free session with every 3 and 4 night booking and 2 free sessions with every 5,6,7 night booking. Further sessions are available at a cost of £10 per person". It would appear that the loose boxes are being used in conjunction with the business.

The planning meeting of the 15th February 2018 item SMD/2017/0764 is now the subject of a stage 2 complaint procedure. In the meeting the officer in giving his submission stated that planning permission was obtained in 2007 for the small patio areas. Clearly this was incorrect, the planning permission granted in 2007 was for damp and general maintenance not for patio areas. Therefore the decision in respect of this application had not been issued after seeking advice from the council's solicitor.

I would ask the council to consider that a certificate of lawful development in regard to this application is insufficient. The correct procedure would be that the land behind the barns should have a change of use prior to being included in the application to remove condition 3. This application is flawed and the only way to rectify this would be a change of use for the agricultural land. Otherwise this gives the impression that the SMDC planning regulations can be ignored. Assurances were given in 2008 that the damp course area had not got planning permission for use as a patio area. In 2008 the only reason given for enforcement not taking place was that the council felt it was not expedient to do so.

Finally I believe that this should not be a delegated decision and should be put before the planning committee. _