

Planning Application SMD/2022/0175

From – The residents of 1-10 Masfield Close, 100 and 102 Froghall Road

Date 17th June 2022

To:

Lisa Jackson – Case Officer

Planning Committee

Joe Porter – Cabinet Member Climate Change and Biodiversity, Brown edge and Endon Ward

Cllr Philip Routledge – Cheadle North East Ward

Cllr Stephen Ellis – Cheadle North East

Re: Planning Application SMD/2022/0175

Proposed extension to an existing yard area to provide additional parking and associated landscaping.

As the residents of Masfield Close and Froghall Road, we have several objections to the proposed application. These shall be listed below.

1. Notification to residents within the vicinity
2. Date of the Landscape, Visual Inspection Assessment and Landscape Design Report
3. Increased Noise Pollution
4. Increase in Light Pollution
5. Increase in traffic
6. Lack of Ecological, Environmental or Biodiversity Reports
7. Increased risk of flooding to Masfield Close Gardens
8. No mitigation for additional surface water into Cecily Brook
9. Detrimental effect to habitat for local wildlife.
10. Carbon Footprint

1. Notification to the residents within the vicinity

Residents south of the proposed site – Masfield Close and Froghall Road – have not been notified by letter of the proposed application. As residents of Masfield Close, are and shall be, further affected by the development – increased vehicles/traffic, more noise and light pollution, potential risk of further flooding to our gardens should we not have been informed? We first read the proposal in the local paper (Cheadle and Tean Times on 1st June 2022). The effect to Froghall Road residents include; increased vehicles/traffic, more noise and light pollution.

As a commercial application should properties other than those opposite the site be notified?

2. Date of the Landscape, Visual Inspection Assessment and Landscape Design Report

The above report is dated February 2021. At this time the South Boundary hedge and trees on Mr Shirley's land – known as 111 Froghall Road – were in situ and provided screening to the yard and a barrier to combat noise and light pollution. Since the report was completed in February 2021 during the later half of the year 2021, Mr Shirley removed his boundary hedges and trees, all of which were of substantial growth, density and height, for approximately 50m along the south line of 111 Froghall Road, the yard and the gardens of 1-8 Masfield Close. This has now allowed the noise and lights of the lorries to be clearly seen and heard from MJS Transport. Several residents ground floor rooms can now be clearly seen into by employees and visitors to the yard. As the majority of the bedrooms to the properties of Masfield Close are at the rear, the additional noise and lights are causing sleeping issues for residents, especially in the early morning 3-6am. This was not an issue prior to the established hedgerow being removed.

3. Increased Noise Pollution

The addition of a further 35 HGV and articulated lorries (not LGV or PCV as stated on the Planning Application) and 21 cars will increase the noise pollution heard by local residents.

The Rob Duncan Planning consultancy report states 5.5 '.....in a typical week lorries leave the site from 2am-6am...' The increased noise from cars arriving, car doors being shut, lorries starting up and running for 15-20mins as vehicle checks are completed will be more noticeable to residents within the vicinity, especially as noise carries at night in the early morning.

Since the south boundary vegetation has been removed the noise impact of the current yard has increased. As the removed vegetation was of an evergreen nature, once the remaining limited vegetation along Cecily Brook and in the rear gardens of Masefield Close drop their leaves in the winter there is no natural sound barrier between the yard and Masefield Close.

The planning application indicates the position of the new lorries is cabs facing Masefield Close, this implies additional light sources to the resident (see 4) if the vehicles are turned to face the north aspect, we will have automated 'Vehicle is reversing' adding to the noise levels. This is also impractical from a Health and Safety point of view of increasing reversing vehicles and pedestrian contact within the yard.

4. Increase in Light Pollution

The additional vehicles are creating further light to pollution to residents, especially in the winter months, again in the morning and early evening when it is expected the yard is to be at it's busiest.

The proposed site plan indicates the position of approximately 50 1m high light bollards around the extended lorry parking and new carpark. There is no reference to taller security lights.

Since the south boundary hedgerow and trees have been removed several security lights are now visible from the properties in Masefield Close.

5. Increase in traffic

The proposals indicate a further 21 cars and 35 HGV's. The effect of this on the local infrastructure is detrimental. The yard is accessed by a 'B' road.

Two new housing estates- Cecily Mills – approx. 121 houses, accessible from Churchill Road from Froghall Road, and Persimmon on Froghall Road – approx. 125-135 houses and a school are in the process of being developed and have a joint potential of a further 490-512 (based on 2 cars per household) and local school traffic cars utilising Froghall Road.

There is already congestion on the approach to Leek Road from Froghall Road, with the current lorries trying to swing in the turning and cars parked at the top of Froghall Road. The road is struggling to cope at present without this significant increase in traffic from the housing estates. As the majority of lorries are stated to return to the yard between mid/late afternoon - 9pm this will coincide with residents returning home, schools finishing times, JCB factories finishing.

The Robert Duncan Planning Consultancy Report indicates, if agreed the number of 3rd party delivery vehicles will reduce, surely the increase in company vehicles is a replacement for the 3rd party deliveries, as the company vehicles will undertake the role of the 3rd party deliveries. Therefore reduction of 3rd party deliveries is negligible?

The Robert Duncan Planning Consultancy Report indicates other sites within the surrounding area – Leek, Creswell, other areas of Cheadle have been considered, but do not suit the needs. Mr Shirley is a Director of Shirley's Transport based at Cellarhead Stoke on Trent. Could this not be a viable option? An operational transport yard is already established, it is located on an 'A' road with direct access to the A50/A500, Leek and Moorlands areas.

6. Lack of Ecological, Environmental or Biodiversity Reports

There is no evidence of Ecological, Environment or Biodiversity reports being undertaken.

What is the impact of the additional vehicles and yard expansion to the surrounding habitats, wildlife, waterways, residents, neighbouring roads, traffic implications, light and noise pollution.

The proposal is in a Green Belt, surely these reports are highly important to protect the green belt?

7. Increased risk of flooding to Masefield Close Gardens

The site plan indicates new drainage for storm/surface water is to run into the existing drainage system, which feeds into Cecily Brook. The gardens of Masefield Close already flood when the brook breaks it's banks. The additional water from the yard which is to be sent to the brook will increase the likelihood and span of the flood water.

Can the current system cope with the additional storm/surface water? The field as is, now currently absorbs water from storms/rain etc once this is concreted over this facility is lost and the water will be channelled into the brook.

Is there provision for the run off of water used when lorry washing or is this to run into Cecily Brook as well?

Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan Flood Policy The policy states '..... where development sites are located and /or affected by the presence of watercourses, the council expects developers to discuss proposals with the EA and LLFA ' (The proposed extension is not in a flood zone, however the runoff water into Cecily Brook borders a flood zone 3 between Cecily Brook and the gardens of Masefield Close. The plans indicate additional surface water is to run into Cecily Brook increasing the potential of flooding). Has contact with the EA or LLFA been made?

8. No mitigation for additional surface water into Cecily Brook

A previous planning application in 2014 indicates a water containment pipe and separator where to be installed at the west elevation of the site to hold water until it was passed into the stream via the hydrobreaker, is this facility still operational and will it cope with the additional water anticipated through the expansion?

9. Detrimental effect to habitat for local wildlife

The location of the proposed planning is in a green belt area. Removing natural habitat and creating a hard standing area of 3386sqm is detrimental to the ethos and council policy for green belts.

Mr Shirley has in the last year removed 50m of natural hedge and trees from the south boundary of his land, bordering Masefield Close. This has had a dramatic effect on the wildlife in the area. A local count of birds and types in the gardens of Masefield Close shows a decrease of at least 10 varieties and drop in numbers.

The application indicates a native hedge and trees shall be laid to the North and East boundaries, this will not compensate for the south hedgerow already removed. A previous application for MJS Transport in Feb 2014, when the yard was previously extended, also indicated that a native hedge and trees should be planted to the North elevation. This was not completed.

10 Carbon Footprint

In direct opposition to Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan Policy T2 Other sustainable Transport Measures, Staffs Moorlands seek to minimise the environmental impact of freight road transport, an additional 35 HGV's does not appear to reflect this policy.

The proposed plans do not indicate any strategies which would assist in the reduction of the carbon footprint, such as electrical charging points for vehicles. The identified operational hours imply public transport would not be a viable option for employees due to the hours worked so car use would be required.

The proposed planting scheme would not counteract the footprint generated by the vehicles, especially as 50m of established hedgerow and trees have recently been removed from the south boundary of Mr Shirley's land.

In conclusion, we the residents of Masefield Close and Froghall Road, believe the above application should be suspended until

- a) A full consultation with all residents in the vicinity of the application, including Froghall Road has been completed
- b) A full survey of the site – ecological, environmental and bio diversity has been completed
- c) A review of the current and future implications of noise, light and traffic flow to the neighbouring properties, both during sociable and unsociable hours, winter and summer has been completed
- d) An assessment of the additional impact of surface water to Cecily Brook and measures to reduce potential worsening flooding to Masefield Close properties, and if the current water containment pipe, separator and hydrobreaker are sufficiently capable of handling the increased water load, can the brook handle the increased load?

Yours Sincerely

