From: Haywood, Ben
To: Planning Comments (SMDC)
Subject: FW: DOC/2022/0001 Winkhill Garage
Date: 19 January 2022 14:10:36

From: Kath Riley
Sent: 19 January 2022 13:58
To: Haywood, Ben (SMDC) <Ben.Haywood@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk>; Roberts, Paul (CLLR)
Subject: Re: DOC/2022/0001 Winkhill Garage

I refer to the proposals put forward to justify the discharge of conditions attached to the temporary planning permission for the parking of tankers at Winkhill Garage, and would like to make the following points:

- The applicant claims that the stored topsoil and seed bank has been distributed over the bank on the eastern side of the site. This is not true. All that was distributed once the quarrying ceased was the waste produced by that activity and generated by the crushing of the stone that was removed. The only vegetation that has re-generated on the bank is gorse and weeds such as ragwort - a poisonous weed which creates seed that contaminate adjoining land, requiring its removal by landowners of said adjoining land since it is poisonous to stock grazing on that land. I maintain that the applicant should be required to carry out full and proper restoration of the lowland heath habitat that was destroyed and that is required under the conditions of the original approval.

I quote Steve Massey's , SMDC Arboricultural Officer, response to application SMD/2019/0339 for the temporary parking of tankers:

'no evidence that any of the planting approved under condition 17 (of the original application) has yet been provided, nor any active heathland creation/recreation has been carried out - there is some quite extensive natural regeneration of gorse on the excavated/re-graded hillside around the NE ands SE sides of the operational site, but no sign of any heather, bell heather, bilberry etc which was previously present on site prior to excavation and which would also be major components of a heathland creation scheme.' dated 07/01/2020

- There is no indication of what action will be taken if the new owner of the land adjoining Area E does not give authorisation for the planting that is required. The land in question was in the ownership of the applicant, was any provision made in the terms of the sale of the land to allow for the required planting?
- In regard to the statements concerning Areas G and I - there is no indication of when the 'works' will be completed. It is surely not for the applicant to decide on the timescale for the implementation of conditions when an enforcement notice has been served. It is already almost fourteen years since the original planning permission for the development of the site was granted and there is no sign of any activity which would suggest that there is any intention to complete the 'works'. It would seem that the applicant proposes to leave the eyesore at is indefinitely.

Kath Riley

Amadeus Cottage
Winkhill
Leek
ST13 7PP

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.highpeak.gov.uk/YourData

---