From:
Sent: 27 June 2019 12:27
To: Planning Comments (SMDC)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access

Categories:

Application Reference No. : SMD/2019/0362 Site Address: 5 Draycott Old Road Forsbrook Staffordshire ST11 9AL Stoke-On-Trent
Comments by: M Downward
From:

Cheadle Road
Forsbrook
Stoke on Trent

Phone:
Email:
Submission: Objection
Comments: Submission: Objection

Comments: In addition to my original concerns as outlined below, I have read further the resubmission and would like to reiterate a number of points which still do not seem to have been addressed. This application has clearly not changed in any substantial way.

The boundary is still incorrect. Check your records and land registry. How can this be an accurate submission if such basic errors are permitted? The development will impair the village even further, most residents including near neighbours are spending time and money renovating property to blend in with the local area apart from two developments which seem to have been permitted.

Also since my last objection there has been as predicted a serious crash on the very area which I highlighted as being a danger, the junction with Dilhorne Road, check you records again for this. Traffic from the Cheadle direction travel overwhelmingly too fast a further entrance, exit and also the ensuing extra traffic for building works will only make matters worse. There has also been work on properties in the village such as the Roebuck public house and an increase in traffic from the Draycott Old Road junction.

Both of these have caused difficult driving conditions and a further increase of traffic to the Cheadle Road, along with the junction of Draycott Old Road will lead to further accidents, which could be prevented. The proposed develop as well as the lack of parking for 5 Draycott Old road are clearly going to exacerbate the situation.

I would ask the council to see sense and deny this application.

There are a number of specific issues with regard to this planning application which give rise to my objections.

1. My property is currently not overlooked by any adjoining property, with the exception of two small windows behind a hedge to the rear from 58A Cheadle Road. The privacy entailed by this was a major decision in our purchase of the property. Any additional development would impair this.

2. Any further developments in the area would change the outlook we have from our property. Currently where our property faces the proposed site there is no visible development apart from a recently opened gap where the owners of the site have already begun to clear some trees and foliage. This clearance has continued at infrequent intervals.

3. Further or any removal of trees would undoubtedly change the appearance and feel of the overall area. Forsbrook, despite being on a major road, still retains the character of a small rural village. This would be seriously undermined further if the development is allowed to proceed.

4. The proposed development would increase traffic on Cheadle Road at a position where it is already dangerous due to the current bends from both directions, the junction with Dilhorne Road and, despite speed restriction signs,vehicles regularly exceeding the speed limits. It is only a matter of time before a serious accident occurs at this location. Leaving my property can sometimes be similar to a game of roulette. See points raised above.

5. The traffic situation on Draycott Old Road also needs to be considered. There is little if any 'off street' parking for the house of the proposer and those nearby. The development plot is meant to be the rear access for number 5, removal of this will exacerbate the parking problems on a narrow, twisty country lane with little if any footpath. Close to a difficult junction with the Cheadle Road, which is very difficult to navigate during the day.

6. The site plan from the architects Messrs Hewitt and Carr, is again significantly inaccurate. It details the development site/plot extending beyond the actual site boundary across public footpath/council land. If this is the case it will impinge upon normal transit of pedestrians, the entry and exit to my property, also numbers 58A and 58.

Again increasing the potential traffic and pedestrian transit across this area raises issues of safety at a dangerous position on a bend, where traffic does not adhere to the safety limts.

7. Finally any major construction / development work will impact severely on our own ability to enjoy our own property and garden, in a 'normal' civilised manner.

I trust these comments are clear and understandable and are issued to support my objection to this proposal.

If you require and further help or information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully

M Downward