

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

Wesley House
Kingsley
Kingsley

ST10 2AE

Submission: Objection
Comments: JACK LUCAS

RE: Planning (SMDC) SMD/2021/0565

This is my objection letter against the proposal to build a property next to mine and my grandparents' homes.

I have been shown the minutes from the Parish Council meeting and I believe that these points should be taken seriously. I agree with the suggestion made by some that there should really be a site meeting where people from the planning department come out and have a look at this in more detail because it isn't fair on the current residents in the area.

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

I have done some research about planning and from what I can tell it should not be okay to build modern developments that do not really match the surroundings. All the houses closest to this site are either stone or are of historic significance. There is a listed building, and this new house if building goes ahead will be in full view from The Old Smithy.

The ancient wall next to my father's house has already been damaged from the heavy wagons coming up and down the lane and cutting the corner at the bottom of the pavement, and when they reversed up they were going so close to the wall it's a wonder it didn't fall down. And this is even before any construction work is meant to have gone ahead, I didn't know they were allowed to do this. If it did fall down, we'd like to know who would be held responsible. Also the ancient well caved in and caused damage to our electrics. We had a total power outage and had to pay to have it all fixed because of these wagons reversing up and mounting the pavements of the main road (both at the front and the back).

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

I think this type of house is too big for this plot. I know when I looked at the guide on how to write these that it said views shouldn't be taken into consideration, but if you think about it - if any one of us owned no. 40 (a stone cottage) or the bungalow on the hill (both of them pretty much look directly over the site) it would be really upsetting to have this on your doorstep - literally. It's not really just about a spoiled view for no. 40, they will have no privacy and be completely overlooked. And it will make them feel really penned in and I think probably there will be some loss of light too.

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.

Everyone knows that parking in the village has been a nightmare for a long time, but we all have noticed it get worse in the past 5 years or so.

Because of how many houses don't have their own parking, people in the village 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. The MP Karen Bradley came out to discuss how difficult parking is in this village with residents, so it is not as if this isn't something that isn't well known.

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

The fence that they've put in makes it impossible for the people who already live on the lane and use it to get to their houses to be able to get out again without reversing. Even though they have a right to access to their homes, the fences have been put up and now they can't get in or out without reversing on to a main road.

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 visibility is really bad if you are pulling out of this lane, it's bad enough anywhere on this road but this has got to be the worst spot because of the parked cars too. I don't know what time of day Highways came to look if they've okayed it, but it obviously wasn't on a typical days, as normally you can't see down the road for parked cars.

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

Looking at the plans, they don't really show no proper turning circle, only a total of 4 parking spaces for the people building the house. As I said before, 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. I really don't understand how this would be allowed if they all have rights to use it and suddenly someone (even if they own the land) can come along and make the road too narrow for cars to pass any more? They could at least move the bottom two parking spaces back and make a place for the van at no. 40 to turn here.

7 Access Rights: The driveway is used by several nearby properties.

The access rights are apparently compromised by the proposed development.

The big wagons accessing the area to dig out footings in the rock have already caused damage to the historic 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 is already fragile because of the historic well located here so driving large wagons over this pavement where the drain is is not a good idea. 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. It's also one of the main ways (by vehicle) to get to the masts that sit on the old quarry site. Surely those who are concerned with the maintenance of the mast need to be informed/consulted about this?

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

On the plans the applicant has ticked 'cannot be seen from a public area' and it can obviously be seen from the public footpath. How is it okay for this to be ticked? Also it will be important to ensure that this footpath isn't relocated toward Woodland if this goes ahead, it will be difficult to know whether it has because of how much of the rock has been dug out already.

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, who will pay for any damage caused?

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 I've already said, there should be access for the quarry and the mast but also It is very important that access rights and a proper space for turning is measured and guaranteed for the 3 properties who have access rights (deed of easement) 40, 42 and 44 to be able to turn all of their cars and vans around. If there's going to be possibly

In summary, I object to this planning, and can't believe they've already been allowed to dig out the land as much as they have. I hope this can be stopped. We don't have to risk people being injured (or worse) or property being damaged unnecessarily as a result of what is inappropriate development in the area.

Regards,

Jack Lucas
