

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** 14 February 2022 12:05  
**To:**  
**Subject:** Comment Received from Public Access

Application Reference No. : SMD/2021/0829 Site Address: Land At Blythe Park Sandon Road Cresswell Staffordshire  
Comments by: Lindon Horleston

From:  
18 Sandon Road, Cresswell, Cresswell  
Cresswell  
Cresswell Staffs moorlands  
Cresswell, Stoke-on-Trent  
Staffordshire  
ST11 9RB

Phone:  
Email:  
Submission: Objection  
Comments: Mr L Horleston#

18 Sandon Road

Cresswell

Stoke-On-Trent

Staffordshire

ST11 9RB

Email :

Mobile

Date 30th January 2022

Variation of planning SMD/2021/0829

FTAO Ben Haywood chief Planning officer

Introduction

Dear Mr Haywood, I am concerned and in total shock of the inconsistency on the new variation of plans put forward by the developer thus affecting all resident especially the residents of Cresswell. I will address this point later.

My property is directly opposite the new proposed entrance, there has been total disregard demonstrated to all residents of Cresswell and the Draycott Parrish residents of Uttoxeter road Sandon Lane.

I have to say especially to individual residents directly opposite the new proposed entrance in Cresswell. It is total madness and brutal to allow the whole industrial estate traffic with its expansion combined with the proposed 170 houses just to spew out within 20 feet of our property entrances. This is because the roundabout in its original location away from residents has been removed and the original service road protection to their houses have also been removed from the original plans agreed and passed by the planning committee and planning officers.

This assault on residents will be day and night 24-7 light pollution where head lights will be shining directly up our drives into our window at night. Noise pollution where heavy goods vehicles will be stopping at the entrance and pulling off will make it impossible to sleep on hot summer nights when you need to open your windows.

No compensation policy set in place can alleviate the trauma this will inflict on individual residents; planning permissions are refused for frivolous reasons when a window overlooks a neighbour's garden this is not that it's a nightmare scenario in planning terms and you cannot allow this type of bully tactics in responsible planning.

This of course is a go to tactic often used by developers to undo what was promised originally and democratically passed only to manipulate the planning system and council officials and the all-important planning committee into passing these poor variations of plans at the expense of residents and road users' safety.

From a Planning perspective considering Traffic and safety 5 deaths to date

Simon Haw senior highways officer came down to address all residents in Cresswell particularly the houses opposite directly affected not just me, he sold us the original outlay of the roundabouts, stating there is nothing better than to include roundabouts into a new infrastructure layout.

It is safe it allows for calming traffic measures down the road where deaths have occurred and approaching the railway line, you will have a service road to your houses to keep you safe and away from the industrial traffic coming off the increased industrial estate, he even took into account to lower curbs considering getting larger vehicles in and out of residents drives like my 21 foot motorhome and the neighbours long wheel base working vehicle, he said it would make us safer and that's why he has backed the infrastructures layout.

These were not only his words they were the developers plans there was nothing better. Roundabouts are king was his exact words.

So why are we even considering an inferior infrastructure plan that does nothing for residents' safety or road safety where the ultimate traffic calming measure (the roundabout) coming down Sandon Road has been removed. Highways comment originally the roundabouts were put in for safety by, note the developer.

I put this to Simon Hawe over a long telephone conversation a few days ago, Simon Hawes answer was, He doesn't think he could do the original infrastructure if he puts all the safety features of roundabouts and slip roads in, my reply but doesn't the developer have a grant that LEP (local enterprise partnerships) are holding of well over a million pounds to do the better and original infrastructure? Simon Haw said yes, he does.

So, there you have it from a planning perspective he wants to put an inferior road traffic plan in against one that is better and already in place that was sold to the residents to except and not fight at the time of the original application.

I am sorry Mr Haywood but that is not a good planning reason to allow an inferior variation of plans that serves only the developer. If this if passed it puts us right back where we started, increased traffic but now poor infrastructure and a huge risk to residents and all road users.

So, I will address the inconsistency of these variations of plans mentioned earlier, Uttoxeter road residents have acquired and are entitled to have a slip road at the Tee junction to keep them safe and make it easier for them to enter and exit their homes.

Correspondingly so do the Cresswell residents, but what has transpired here is the developer has taken the Cresswell residents protections away, (their slip road) and given it to the Uttoxeter road residents.

you can't take a safety feature that is an integral part of the infrastructure off one set of residents and give it to another, presumably to inspire those residents to not object for fear of having those protections taken away, that is not responsible planning Mr Haywood.

It is inciting fear into planning by design causing chaos.

As in Cresswell some Residents won't object out of fear that the entrance may be moved nearer to their property seeing what the developer is capable of removing safeguards from certain residents to give to other residents, it's an abuse of its obligations to fair and consistent planning, this cannot be allowed and is the worst I have seen from this developer.

Where has the road widening and footpaths gone at the pinch point the narrowest part of the road where two HGV vehicles can not pass each other leaving no room for children walking to school it was included by the developer to protect all residents and their children, this is a fundamental and integral part of the safety infrastructure of the road leading out of Cresswell. We warned planners and highways at the time that the developer could not achieve this road widening and insert footpaths, we were assured the developer could. Simon Hawe senior highways officer assured us several days ago that Highways would object if the footpaths were removed, well they have been!!!

Well, here we are again with a variation of plans that now are taking out the road widening and footpaths. The developer has absolute disregard for Planning officers, the planning committee who passed the original application and most of all the safety of residents and their children, it's appalling behaviour by the developer.

From a planning perspective these variations of plans are deeply flawed unsafe and at the very least question the developers conduct and duties in planning terms. When The Code of Professional Conduct (the Code) sets out and explains the standards of professional conduct and practice which the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA or the Institute) requires of all its members, the way this Variation has been designed does not mirror this code.

From Residents point of view and other road users

The new entrance will surely increase the chances of more deaths at the very worst and will certainly cause new accidents if not deaths, my neighbour will have the same struggle where he must back in his long wheelbase working vehicle for his window business, I have to try and reverse a 21 foot motorhome now considering traffic coming up and down Sandon road and now traffic coming in and out of the new entrance with an expanded industrial estate and another 170 houses complete madness.

I will be blocking filter lanes blocking the view of road users on Sandon Road to traffic in and out of the estate its dangerous and a very dangerous variation of a planning to present, the new variation of plans has not considered residents safety and other road users at all the original plans did.

Are the developer and highways asking me and my neighbour to sell our vehicles my neighbour's livelihood just to stop potential accidents? Furthermore, shut our windows and curtains permanently, this is ludicrous and cannot be allowed.

My Motorhome is my pride and joy and I use it most days to get out into the countryside to watch wildlife of which is my passion. I must back my vehicle in as it is 8 metres long It would be careless of me not too, I would be having no

disregard for road safety for me to backout onto a fast busy road with 5 deaths to its credit and one virtually opposite to me, it is the nature of the road that have brought these deaths. The roundabout would have put an end to the potential threat this road has too all.

#### Summing up points

¿ Original infrastructure plans better safer passed and excepted by residents, Simon Hawes chief highways officer fraise, roundabouts are king!!!

¿ Grant of over a million pounds already sitting in LEP account ready to use for the original infrastructure!!!

¿ Road safety of residents compromised by new the plans no road widening of the road at the pinch point and footpaths removed.

¿ Unacceptable demands of noise and light pollution put on residents

¿ Misleading residents and council by the developer to put expectable infrastructure plans in to get them passed and agreed by residents, the parish and council only to submit variation of plans later to undermine the original plans and have total disregard for council and residents!!!

¿ There were not enough letters sent out to all residents that will be affected not even to residents right opposite!!!

¿ There should be an extension of the consultation to allow parish council to sit and discuss the plans and converse with residents to gain the full facts and prepare an objection to the variation of plans!!!

¿ Inconsistency in planning by Removing slip roads from some residents and giving it to other residents.

¿ Planning by design to pit resident against each other for fear of the developer removing safeguards to increase exposure to other residents.

¿ The developer cannot blame cost for these variations the grant has been there with LEP for many years if any costs have risen it is down to the developer's inaction to implement the infrastructure, we have been here waiting in limbo since 2014, the developer chose not to use these monies from LEP at the time they were available.

¿ The table and information below shows the timetable and schedules proposed and ignored.

¿ Phase 1 on the outline planning application was created to put in to place better road infrastructure than there is at the moment. This includes the pinch point by the Izaak Walton where there are no pedestrian footpaths, and two lorries are unable to pass. This is a major Health and Safety issue that is being ignored. The resolution of this is not included on the present application.

¿ The Draycott roundabout is predicted to take place AFTER this phase 1 application has been completed. This was put in place to relieve the queues that are created in the morning and evening. More lorries and traffic will be moving on and off the site when the industrial building is created for the Greenhouse People.

¿ The original plan states that Phase 2 will then be the residential development working in tandem with the industrial development. Its all here below.

¿ Reference: PLANNING APPLICATION NO SMD/2017/0722

Approval of Reserved matters following outline permission SMD/2014/0576 for: 1. Phase 1A ¿ New/realigned access road; 2. Phase 1B ¿ Commercial development plot 1 containing a warehouse assembly unit to serve the Greenhouse People Limited; and 3. Phase 1C ¿ New entrance roundabout.

The Residents know the status of Cresswell being a hamlet will change as the predominant area will be an industrial estate rather than a balanced residential and industrial area which is why the plan was passed in February 2015.

Why is the developer with these variations now taking away what little the developer offered in the way of infrastructure and safety? You can not let this happen Mr Haywood.

A brief reminder by a government inspector comments below of what should never have been passed and was forced upon the hamlet and its residents. We know this is futile now, but it shows the compromise we have endured and the injustices we are still fighting by rouge developers.

The planning inspector Patrick Whitehead stated: -

The support for the expansion of the Blythe Business Park is not justified in the supporting text. The evidence indicates 70ha of employment land available in rural areas (over 56ha with planning permission) [doc MC(5)], and the location of the site is within a Special Landscape Area (Local Plan, Policy N8). There is no evidence before this Examination to indicate that account has been taken of the proximity and potential impact on the neighbouring settlement of Cresswell, or that the known toxicity of industrial waste has been acknowledged as part of the process of determining whether the principle of expansion is feasible or desirable.

---

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>

---