
From: planningcomments@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk
Sent: 10 October 2021 15:34
To: Planning Comments (SMDC)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access

Categories:

Application Reference No. : SMD/2021/0565 Site Address: Land Adj The Bungalow High Street Kingsley
Staffordshire Comments by: JENNIFER WILKINSON

From:

HIGH STREET
Kingsley
KINGSLEY

ST10 2AE

Phone:

Email:

Submission: Neither

Comments: JENNIFER WILKINSON

RE: Planning (SMDC) SMD/2021/0565

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to object to the proposed property adjacent to my house.

As was mentioned in the minutes from the Parish Council meeting there

are a number of concerns from residents who live in close proximity to

the site. I would like to request a site meeting to discuss the particulars of this proposal in detail, and to show those making the decisions precisely what the immediate neighbours' legitimate concerns are.

1. Historic Buildings: The proposal may have a negative impact on
nearby historic buildings, (Wesleyan Chapel and The Old Smithy).

The properties in the immediate area all have historic significance. The Old Smithy property dates back to the 1600s and is Grade II Listed. The proposed house would clearly not be in keeping with the houses in the area, all of which

are either stone-built with partial facing or made of historic handmade bricks, or are religious buildings of historic significance (including the Wesleyan Chapel and the other nearby former chapel - the Temperance Hall). This property would be an eyesore in the context of the above and when consulted on this, the relevant bodies who would be concerned by such issues of a listed building would only have been consulted on the basis that this was a small bungalow, not a large 4 bedroomed family home. I know I speak for many when I say I do not feel that this is suitable for the location in general, as it will be imposing in this space quite aside from the impact to the character and nature of the setting.

There is also the issue of the historic boundary wall, which is clearly being weakened and has experienced the effects of the movement of earth as a result of these heavy construction vehicles repeatedly reversing up and driving down the lane in close proximity to the wall.

This historic wall is in the process of being declared as listed. It needs to be made clear who is happy to be held responsible for any damage to the wall now and in the future. at some points the soil has been completely taken away from the wall with heavy machinery knocking the edge of it - all without any prior consultation with the owner.

2 Inappropriate Development: The design of the proposed house is inconsistent with other properties in the area.

In general this family home is not suitably located on this plot. It will be imposing and will completely ruin the view from the Bungalow behind the old Chapel, as well as the view from no. 40 and no. 44.

3 Highway Safety: The traffic volumes are considerably higher now which makes a material change to the circumstances of this application compared to those considered previously. The risk of accidents is greatly increased.

It is not safe to exit the lane at the best of times, but certainly

not given the fact that the scarce provision for parking in the village forces people to park on the roads outside their homes. How can bringing yet more traffic and potential parking (e.g. if new-builds have visitors etc.) be helpful to a village where parking is already way beyond capacity.

4 Vehicles having to reverse out onto the busy road is a grave concern.

The current fencing put in place has restricted turning for vehicles who have right of access to this road, this has forced them to have to reverse into a main road, or to reverse backwards into their own properties in order to access their homes. This was done without warning or permission.

5 The access drive onto the site is very narrow. Vehicles legitimately park on the High Street near the site entrance. Vehicles leaving the site driveway have a poor view either side of traffic on the busy main road.

The parking in the village has always been an issue, but has worsened significantly in recent years. Therefore circumstances have changed and this application ought to be treated as a fresh application.

6 Highway Safety would be compromised without the provision of a turning area for the applicant and other driveway users.

Currently the plan shows no turning circle, only a total of 4 parking

spaces for the proposed dwelling. This would leave those who have rights of access to the road to be no longer entitled to access their properties without being forced to reverse either up or down the lane

7 Access Rights: The driveway is used by several nearby properties. The access rights are apparently compromised by the proposed development.

There have been serious concerns regarding the access to this site by large construction vehicles. Those that have already been accessing the area to dig out footings in the rock have already caused significant damage to the historic boundary wall to the right of the lane when accessing the site, as well as causing significant enough damage to the electrics that run under the pavement to cause loss of power. The ground around this area is fragile as there is an historic well located here, this is likely to be one of the contributing reasons for this damage. Also, this lane (as well as being the only way of accessing properties 40, 42 and 44) is an access road to the old quarry site, and access to the old quarry might be necessary were there to be a need for Kingsley stone which has a particular aesthetic and could be needed for other properties of significance (e.g. St. Werburgh's Church and other local farms and houses) . It is also the only access to the mast in the woodland that sits on the old quarry site. Surely those who are concerned with the maintenance of the mast need to be informed/consulted about this matter?

Also the entrance to the lane requires a 4.2 metre width for Highways to accept this proposal. Looking at the most recent official title

deeds of Wesley House and No. 42, there is clearly not 4.2 metres width without encroaching on the land of these two properties, so unless Highways changes this proviso, surely this application would need to be refused on this count alone? The only way they can get 4.2 metres is if they were to argue that the pavement area could be used to create an initial first 1 metre (from the edge of the front boundaries of 42 and Wesley House to the front of the edge of the curb) and allow this to be considered passable as 4.2 metres entrance width, but surely in this instance any entrance could be deemed wide enough for any Highways stipulation provided it has pavement? I think there needs to be a site meeting to discuss this matter amongst others.

8 Footpath 8: FP8 runs immediately to the rear of the site and may be compromised by the building.

It will be important to ensure that this footpath isn't pushed back toward the woodland as if construction were to go ahead, it will be difficult to vet whether or not this has happened, due to the way in which the landscape has been so considerably altered already (the area is now all excavated rock).

9 The buildings on either side of the access are of considerable age and attempts to modify the access risk significant damage to them as does the passage of heavy construction vehicles. The electricity supply to the former Chapel has already been ruptured.

As well as the wall I've already mentioned, there has also been

general damage to the tarmac on the lane itself (cracks are appearing outside no. 40) and as these buildings as well as the historic wall have no foundations, it is a big concern that further disruption to the terrain could cause severe structural damage long term.

10 In the event of a recommendation to approve this application it would be essential to impose conditions to protect the access rights of the occupiers of Nos. 40 and 42 including a). The ability to turn vehicles and b). The use of parking adjacent to their properties by retaining the existing access road profile and gradient.

As mentioned already, there should be access for the quarry and the mast but also It is very important that access rights and provision for turning is maintained for properties the 3 properties who have access rights (deed of easement) 40, 42 and 44 to be able to turn their vehicles.

I also was disappointed not to have been officially notified by letter regarding this proposed development, despite being listed as one of the properties directly affected by the proposal.

Yours sincerely,

Jennifer Wilkinson

Do you really need to print out this Email? Be green - keep it on the screen.

This email is intended for the addressee(s) only and may contain sensitive, privileged or confidential information that could be protectively marked. If you are not the addressee please do not use the information in any way. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it from your system. Thank you.

The Council may be required to disclose this email or any responses to it under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. The way in which we handle personal information is set out in our privacy notice and is available at <https://www.staffs Moorlands.gov.uk/YourData>
