





From:
To: [Planning Comments \(SMDC\)](#)
Subject: SMD/2021/0637
Date: 15 November 2021 16:14:38

Photos to support OBJECTION

Regards
L williamson

-----Original Message-----

From: planningcomments@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk
<planningcomments@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk>
Sent: 15 November 2021 15:26
To:
Subject: Comment submitted for Planning application

Thank you for submitting your comments on the planning application.
This is an acknowledgement to confirm they have been received by the planning department and will be processed within the next 5 working days.
Please find a copy of your submitted comments below.

Application Reference No. : SMD/2021/0637 Site Address: Land Adj To 2 Eastview Main Road Cauldon Low Staffordshire

Comments by: LINDA WILLIAMSON

From:
1
EAST VIEW
CAULDON LOW
STOKE-ON-TRENT
STAFFS
ST10 3EU

Phone:
Email:
Submission: Objection
Comments:

1 East View

Cauldon Low

Stoke-on-Trent

Staffordshire

ST10 3EU

28.10.2021
Application Number SMD/2021/0637

To whom it may concern

As a resident and adjoining neighbour to 2 East View I have concerns in relation to the planning application submitted by Mr and Mrs B & H Duffield, please see below:-

1. Unfortunately, the proposed plot is just before a bend and any parking in front of number 2 and the proposed new build will force drivers on the wrong side of the road on the bend.

Mr and Mrs Duffield currently park on the land allocated for the new build where there is enough turning space, they do not have to reverse in or out of the property. If the new build was to go ahead Mr and Mrs Duffield have allocated two small parking spaces in front of their property this means they will have to reverse in or out of these directly into oncoming traffic. The current access proposed for the new property is directly on the bend where visibility is poor. Unfortunately Main Road is used as a cut through for people travelling from Waterhouses area to Alton, Uttoxeter and the surrounding areas during peak times and they travel at speed. Any additional hazards to Cauldon Low particularly on the bend is an accident waiting to happen.

2. The plans indicate a public foot path running the full length of number 2 and the proposed plot. This is not the case as the footpath finishes a few yards along from the boundary of number 1. This means you will have potentially 5 cars entering and exiting directly onto the road or parking on the road (plus visitors) where people walk. The opposite side of the road is boggy and has no footpath either. Local children walking to catch the school bus and JCB Academy bus use this unpaved stretch of road.

The children will have to walk into the road if cars are parked on the road outside No2 and the new building.

3. I have serious concerns about the water services on the property/land. Number 2 has a shower room and toilet down stairs, bathroom facilities on the second floor and new bathroom facilities in the huge loft conversion. The drains on the properties of number 1 and 2 East View are old, in some places ceramic and currently run under the kitchen extension of no 2. I believe that an additional property would put considerable strain on the current water and sewerage infrastructure.

4. The land drops from the main road into the front of both properties No.1 and No.2,

I have concerns on how this will be tackled when creating the access and parking on the front. Any changes to elevations may cause drainage issues.

The front garden currently gets water logged due to the drop in elevation and the amount of clay in the soil and any changes in the elevation from No2 would undoubtedly perpetuate this.

5. I also have concerns about the wildlife pond currently situated on the proposed building plot. We were made aware by a previous resident that there are breeding Great Crested Newts in the pond. I took a photo of one that came onto our property, which the dog was startled by due to its size, it returned under the fence back into the garden of number 2.

From research I did at the time, the 7-8 inch newt was a female Great Crested Newt (photo attached). If they are on a protected list, I hope that an environmental survey will be carried out as part of the consultation process.

There are issues around the planning application that are deemed not applicable in the consultation process and are not grounds for a planning application to be rejected, but they are good reasons to the people in Caudon Low and myself included.

In the last six months, a large loft extension has been added to No2 East View our adjoining neighbour. As adjoining neighbours, we share land, services, building structure etc.

This extension towers over our property making it look tiny in comparison, our property potentially devalued overnight. This extension has also caused stress and upset to other residents who feel that its appearance is not in keeping and they have no privacy. Concerns that any new build will be just as less sympathetic to all concerned.

If the application was to be approved the view from our back door a potential modern out of character 3-bedroom property instead of fresh air and greenery. We didn't invest in our property to look at another building, we bought it because of the views which are important to peoples well-being.

This does not count but it affects people's lives emotionally and financially, causing great stress to all those concerned whether they live next door or in the other streets affected.

However, my main concern is the integrity of the Caudon Low Village and other villages like it. These villages consists of three types of people, those that have lived in the villages for many years, went to the local schools as children, whose parents were farmers, drivers at Tarmac and worked locally for many many years.

There are those like myself that wanted to leave the town and be part of a community, getting involved in Village Community Groups, participating in Village Hall community events and wanting to be part of a caring community living amongst like-minded people.

Then there are those that see villages as purely investments, private proprietors and small building companies buying up properties and land purely as a business plan, pricing out locals by paying over the odds for properties. The infill policy allows this to happen, Whiston being a prime example where the infill policy allowed for 2 large holiday lets to be built.

In 2018 when the pervious planning permission on 2 East View was rejected the Staffordshire Moorland Development policy at the time stated that any development had to be needed, affordable and in keeping with the surrounding properties. I understand this has changed to an Infill Policy that does not take into consideration the previous policy and neither does this new proposed planning application. It isn't needed, it wont be affordable housing nor does it fit in with existing properties.

I understand that Infill Policy was put into place due to the shortage of development land in the Moorlands but there is no need for any more houses in Caudon Low.

I hope you will take into consideration my formal points 1-5 when considering the proposed planning application but at the same time I hope you can take the time to read the rest of my concerns as it means a lot even though not applicable.

Yours Sincerely

L Williamson

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>

