1 Thornhill Road

Wallbridge Park,

Leek ST13 8HN

Planning Support, Customer Services
7/7/2020

Re - SMD/2020/0329. Applicant Mr R Davies,

Proposed development to Wallbridge Precinct.

We are writing to express our total objection to the above proposed development. The paragraphs below address some of our concerns.

1. The proposed development will jut out beyond the building line for this property. This will have impact on several levels.

The buildings will restrict the view of traffic travelling up Wallbridge Drive, drivers will have less time to see and react to pedestrians such as children leaving the precinct, thus constituting a safety hazard.

The buildings will come right up to the edge of the pavement, jutting out beyond the private houses higher up the street and giving a 'crammed in' and overbearing appearance.

2. The plans are sadly lacking information regarding access to the entry way across the rear of units 1 to the end of the row. This is a public right of way used constantly by Wallbridge residents. Unit 1 is of a lower level at the rear than

Wallbridge Drive, so any alteration for access would require either a slip proof ramp or a set of steps with hand rails on both sides as the incline could be slippery in bad weather. Also, would it be suitable for the emergency services to negotiate should the worst happen. Who would be responsible for maintaining this extended entry way?. The plans are sadly lacking in showing whether this will be a ramp or a flight of steps.

3. If the new flats have a walled forecourt onto the actual precinct then they would jut out beyond the entrances to the small shops and obliterating the view of their doorways. The wall must be kept low ie. no fence on top, so that shop doorways are visible from Wallbridge Drive. If these doorways are not visible then neither is any crime such as a break in. This could make customers feel vulnerable.

4. The design of the extension is out of keeping with Wallbridge property. The current precinct is of an outdated and shoddy 1960's design which would not be an asset to the appearance of the area. These types of building soon take on an air of delapidation. As the extension would come right up to the pavement it would give a overbearing and 'crammed in' appearance. Any modern day construction should be of a pleasing design, not just something which looks cheaply built, dated and out of place.

5. No one has mentioned the Royal Mail postbox. This post box is a vital asset for the residents of Wallbridge. The building plans go over where the post box is sited so what are the plans for the post box reinstatment, as no relocation is shown on the plans.

6. Should worst come to worst and the building work go ahead, what about all the mess, noise and upheaval. Customers going to the three small shops on the precinct would have to negotiate a building site with mess, lorries coming and going, and the potential hazards of tripping or falling objects. Has a risk assessment been done? Many customers going to the hair salon are elderly and unsure of their footing. What about loss of income to the small shops while all this is going on, will they be compensated? What about the busy working bus stop on Wallbridge drive just outside unit 1, would this be affected?.

7. The plans state that this undertaking is 'not an overly large protrusion from the building line'. A protrusion is a protrusion and this projected property will be too close to the road in our opinion.

8. When Wallbridge Precinct was first built it was supposed to be an asset to the community by providing small shops for the local residents. This is how it should remain and new shop keepers should be encouraged to take up the units there. These building plans are neither attractive nor an asset - just simply cramming as much as possible in to an unsuitable space.

We would welcome a reply with regard to all of the questions we have raised.

Yours Sincerely.

David & Linda Ollier.