

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** 22 November 2021 17:33  
**To:** )  
**Subject:** Comment Received from Public Access

Application Reference No. : SMD/2021/0720 Site Address: Land At 58 Uplands Croft Werrington Staffordshire

Comments by: High

From:  
43  
Uplands Croft  
Werrington  
Stoke on Trent

Phone:

Email: tonyhigh43@gmail.com

Submission: Objection

Comments: REASON FOR OBJECTING TO THE PROPOSED BUILDINGS AT 58 UPLANDS CROFT

## 1. ACCESS

In previous applications (SMD/2019/0533) the Highway Department refused permission due to concerns with access to the junction. I can see no improvement in the latest submission. In fact, now that Mr. Blood has confirmed in the Full Planning Application Form that they want access for 8 cars, not including visitors, it would make this access, on the most dangerous part of the street the busiest in the whole street!

He also admits in the application that domestic collection has not been accounted for. This would mean on some collection days the potential for 6 bins blocking the access-would they therefore be left on the pavement causing an obstruction to the public footway, with the potential for somebody having to walk in the road to circumnavigate them? I have included some photographs of what the junction was like for 1 day whilst work was being carried out to a drive that entailed the blocking of the ingress and egress of a neighbour's driveway, causing a potentially dangerous situation on a blind bend. This congestion will be amplified for potentially days, weeks or months whilst the new proposed driveway is being installed. (See Appendix A)

## 2. ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Blood states in the application 'the majority of the trees 'are of relatively poor quality'; and goes on to state that 'the applicant is unable therefore, to control the retention of these trees'becoming something of a liability, rather than an asset, to the visual quality of the locality'. In part 3 he implies that there is no reason to retain these trees. This is in total disagreement to what the actual Tree Survey stated.

Paragraph 6.1 states "that the trees are in generally good condition", only T12 showing decay. Furthermore, it goes on to say "[the trees] form an important part of the local environment and ecology" provides structure in the landscape. In section 3.2 of the survey it explicitly states that the survey "does not" grant the client permission to carry out works on any of the trees included in this survey.

Furthermore in section 8.4 the survey recommends that the "contractor should alter/ relocate the position of Plot 1 in order to prevent any conflict with RPA T11."

Section 8.5 also talks of "putting in protective measures prior to any construction activity commencing"

### 3. ECOLOGY

The Herptile Executive Summary concedes that its report was restricted to the existing property that would normally include an area 2km into the surrounding areas. That said, the report still concluded that the proposed building on the site would result in a high detrimental effect to the local ecology. This is once again against odds with Mr. Blood's assessment.

To me, it appears blatantly obvious that the applicant is trying to trivialize the importance of the environmental impact the building of these two totally unnecessary buildings will cause to the surrounding area

### 4. AMENITIES

I would also like to point out that the local amenities, the schools, Doctor's; dentists are already at full capacity with children now having to travel 3 miles for the nearest available school. Any additional building in Werrington Village will put extra demands on an already severely over stretched infra structure. We only have "Village" amenities and not those of a town!

### SUMMARY

I have lived in Uplands Croft for over 30 years and there has never previously been the need to squeeze extra buildings onto this property. Although Mr. Jones is named as the owner of the property, the said property has remained empty for at least 3 years now. Moreover, he does not live in the bungalow but in Derby some 26 miles away and therefore he will not have to experience any of the disruption if approval is given. I see no social reason for this application; its motive is purely financially driven. It ignores the detrimental environment impact plus the

impact of the well being to the surrounding neighbours, who have already previously voiced their objections to this proposal, with the council upholding our objections and rejecting previous planning permission.

APPENDIX A - Parked contractor vehicles on blind bend

REASON FOR OBJECTING TO THE PROPOSED BUILDINGS AT 58 UPLANDS CROFT

## 1. ACCESS

In previous applications (SMD/2019/0533) the Highway Department refused permission due to concerns with access to the junction. I can see no improvement in the latest submission. In fact, now that Mr. Blood has confirmed in the Full Planning Application Form that they want access for 8 cars, not including visitors, it would make this access, on the most dangerous part of the street the busiest in the whole street!

He also admits in the application that domestic collection has not been accounted for. This would mean on some collection days the potential for 6 bins blocking the access-would they therefore be left on the pavement causing an obstruction to the public footway, with the potential for somebody having to walk in the road to circumnavigate them? I have included some photographs of what the junction was like for 1 day whilst work was being carried out to a drive that entailed the blocking of the ingress and egress of a neighbour's driveway, causing a potentially dangerous situation on a blind bend. This congestion will be amplified for potentially days, weeks or months whilst the new proposed driveway is being installed. (See Appendix A)

## 2. ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Blood states in the application 'the majority of the trees are of relatively poor quality'; and goes on to state that 'the applicant is unable therefore, to control the retention of these trees becoming something of a liability, rather than an asset, to the visual quality of the locality'. In part 3 he implies that there is no reason to retain these trees. This is in total disagreement to what the actual Tree Survey stated.

Paragraph 6.1 states 'that the trees are in generally good condition', only T12 showing decay. Furthermore, it goes on to say '[the trees] form an important part of the local environment and ecology provides structure in the landscape'. In section 3.2 of the survey it explicitly states that the survey 'does not grant the client permission to carry out works on any of the trees included in this survey'.

Furthermore in section 8.4 the survey recommends that the 'contractor should alter/ relocate the position of Plot 1 in order to prevent any conflict with RPA T11'.

Section 8.5 also talks of 'putting in protective measures prior to any construction activity commencing'

## 3. ECOLOGY

The Herptile Executive Summary concedes that its report was restricted to the existing property that would normally include an area 2km into the surrounding areas. That said, the report still concluded that the proposed building on the site would result in a high detrimental effect to the local ecology. This is once again against odds with Mr. Blood's assessment.

To me, it appears blatantly obvious that the applicant is trying to trivialize the importance of the environmental impact the building of these two totally unnecessary buildings will cause to the surrounding area

#### 4. AMENITIES

I would also like to point out that the local amenities, the schools, Doctor's; dentists are already at full capacity with children now having to travel 3 miles for the nearest available school. Any additional building in Werrington Village will put extra demands on an already severely over stretched infra structure. We only have 'Village' amenities and not those of a town!

#### SUMMARY

I have lived in Uplands Croft for over 30 years and there has never previously been the need to squeeze extra buildings onto this property. Although Mr. Jones is named as the owner of the property, the said property has remained empty for at least 3 years now. Moreover, he does not live in the bungalow but in Derby some 26 miles away and therefore he will not have to experience any of the disruption if approval is given. I see no social reason for this application; its motive is purely financially driven. It ignores the detrimental environment impact plus the impact of the well being to the surrounding neighbours, who have already previously voiced their objections to this proposal, with the council upholding our objections and rejecting previous planning permission.

#### APPENDIX A - Parked contractor vehicles on blind bend

---

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>

---