

**Reasons for objecting to the proposed development of 2 holiday lodges**

**at Rosehill, Nabb Lane, Alton, Staffordshire**

**SMD/2023/0226**

1. The proposed development would have a hugely detrimental impact on our residential amenity. The edge of site is 15m from our sitting room and bedroom windows. The noise of 16 holidaymakers in a residential garden would be intolerable. We are entitled to privacy and the quiet enjoyment of our home without noise, smell or light pollution.
2. We are at risk of being subjected to antisocial behaviour from groups such as Hen and Stag parties. (There have been many complaints about noise and antisocial behaviour by local residents in Dimmingsdale, where there is 'lodge' accommodation that can house only 10 people and is often used by groups such as Hen and Stag parties.)
3. The proposed development cannot be considered sustainable as the only public transport in the village is a bus which passes through once in the morning, and comes back in the evening, leaving occupants totally reliant on their cars. The proposal requires another 4 visitor parking spaces, in addition to the 4 they have added due to the previous approved application (SMD/2020/0656). The applicants also have two cars at the property. Should this proposal go ahead there could be ten cars parked at any one time. This doesn't include cars belonging to their own family or visitors. If the lodges are serviced by the applicants they do not provide any employment. If someone is employed there will be yet another car that needs to be parked.

There is no infrastructure for charging cars and no disabled parking.

4. Nabb Lane is a narrow, unlit, single track lane with poor visibility, no pavement and no lighting. It can be dangerous for walkers, horse riders and cyclists as well as the drivers of cars and large agricultural machinery. The development would generate additional traffic onto a congested junction of the B5032, which is one of the major routes to the Alton Towers.
5. There is no detail regarding sewerage and drainage. This is a very important consideration as we want to ensure that a new sewerage system, does not drain onto our land and we do not wish to be subjected to the smell of sewerage. There is no mains drainage in Nabb Lane. The existing system, which was designed for one family, now has to accommodate the sewerage of an additional 8 people in the new units. The proposal will add another 8 people. It seems unlikely that an old fashioned domestic system has capacity for 20+ people.

6. The site is already over developed. Application SMD/2020/0656 has granted accommodation for 8 people in two huge buildings. There have been numerous other applications granted for this site in the past.
7. Both the house and garden of Rosehill lie within an HECZ (Historic Environment Character Zone) relating to two historic farmsteads - Paradise and New House farms. Both Paradise farm, to the South, and Nabb Cottage to the North, are listed buildings. The timber clad lodges would be visible from Nabb Lane not be in keeping with the aesthetic character of the area.
8. The proposal constitutes 'Garden grabbing' which is discouraged at both local and national level.
9. They will have a hugely detrimental effect on wildlife, by removing a massive amount of mature trees and shrubs that are valuable habitat. The scale of this destruction, denoted by a thin green line, cannot be appreciated on Google maps or on the previous block plan. Most of the vegetation, including huge Rhododendrons, is over 15 feet high. The presence of occupants will disturb wildlife. The need for 'inappropriate ambient lighting' 24 hrs a day will be particularly harmful to the resident bat population.
10. They are not in accordance with many of the policies in the local plan, especially Policy E4 and DC 1 which states:

*'All development shall be of an appropriate quality, scale and character compatible with the local area, protect the residential amenity of the area, enhance the heritage, landscape and biodiversity of the area and shall not harm interests of acknowledged importance.'*

Paragraph 5. states that the design should *'protect the amenity of the area, including creation of healthy active environments and residential amenity, in terms of satisfactory daylight, visual impact, sunlight, outlook, privacy, soft landscaping as well as noise, odour and light pollution'*.

I believe that for these reasons this proposed development should be refused.