

From:
To: Comment Received from Public Access
Subject: 08 May 2023 16:20:59
Date:

Application Reference No. : SMD/2023/0132
Site Address: The Orchard Springfield Drive Leek Staffordshire ST13 6ET Leek
Comments by: MR C A KEOGH

From:
10
Deebank Avenue
Leek
Leek
Staffordshire
ST13 6NB
Phone:
Email:
Submission: Objection
Comments: Dear Sirs,

I write with reference to the planning application put forward by Mr John Hurst (ref SMD/2023/0132).

I have read the detailed plans and attendant documents, and would add the following objections.

Whilst I accept that the requirement to post a notice states that this should ideally be posted on the application site itself, in this case, the application impacts both Deebank Heights and Deebank Avenue, which are some distance away from Springfield Drive where the notice is posted. Therefore I submit that it would be prudent to place a notice at the point where Deebank Heights and Deebank Avenue conjoin. I have writtent o the Town and Country Planning Commission for a ruling on this.

I further submit that the application should be rejected on the grounds of its negative effect on local amenity (1), overdevelopment(2), design (3), and with regard to highway safety (4).

I understand that an original plan to develop the Orchard site using access from Springfield Drive (a private road) was declined, and yet the present application seeks access from Deebank Heights which is also a private road. Deebank Heights can only be accessed via Deebank Avenue. The development at Deebank Heights, comprising 7 dwellings, has taken 7 years to complete since permission was granted during which time, as residents of Deebank Avenue, we have suffered an unacceptable and continual disturbance from construction works. For reference, I was recently involved with a roofing contract for some 16 dwellings whcih were built in little more than 11 months. The original plan for Deebank Heights was scaled back on the grounds that it constituted overdevelopment, so surely the same ruling should be extended to the proposed development of the Orchard site given that it is effectively to become an extension of the Deebank Heights development in all but name.

I take issue with the assertion of Mr Nawaz Malik (Stafforshire County Council Highways) that 'sufficient car parking has been allowed for'. Indeed, carparking facilities on Deebank Heights are entirly inadequate and results in visitors to these properties and contractors abandoning vehicles in Deebank Avenue, a situation made worse particularly, as has already been attested, as Mr Hurst would not allow the construction traffic to park on the construction site. I draw the attention of the planning officer to the recommendation by Mr Nawaz that 'Notwithstanding approved plans car parking shall be provided prior to occupation and retained for the lifetime of the development.' Again, I do not see how this can be achieved in Deebank Heights, which is a private road, when it would not be acceptable in Springfield Drive.

Otheres have raised the issue of highways safety, and the pitiful attempt to address this via a notice in Deebank Heights, when 'speed bumps' would have proved a more effective deterrent, and shoudl be enforced. I understand that Deebank Heights was also intended to be a 'private, 'gated' community, but this is not the case, though it would again contribute to road safety and security.

I submit that the erection of dwelling 9 on the plans consitutes overdevelopment and changes the nature of the

neighbourhood. Original access to the Orchard property was via Springfield Drive. The planning permission for Deebank Heights did not allow for its extension to the Orchard property.

Additionally, an inspection of the site from Deebank Heights will expose the fact that the proposed development of dwelling 8 to a 3-story building will materially affect the privacy of those properties close to it, in particular No.12 Springfield Drive as well as 5,6,& 7 Deebank Heights and constitutes unneighbourly behaviour, which is a valid planning objection.

Consequently, I also respectfully request that any inspection of the site should be made from Deebank Avenue and Deebank Heights, which are named in the application and most affected by it.

My final comment is in relation to the degradation of the natural habitat of the area, which has been paid scant consideration during the SEVEN YEARS of the Deebank Height development, and which as others have remarked has all but wiped out a good part of the local flora and fauna that were a part of this area. I note also that the arboricultural report appended to the application and dated June 2022 is in relation to a survey carried out on 19th July 2021 almost 2 years ago, and should be repeated. I note also the rear of the Orchard property is currently being used as a construction base either for the completion of works on Deebank Heights and/or on the Orchard property and that none of the recommendations made in the arboriculture report in relation to BS5837 - 'Protection of trees during construction' appear to be in place.

Respectfully yours

Cy Keogh

Deebank Avenue resident since 1989

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>
