
From: Curley, Jane
Sent: 05 September 2023 10:20
To: Planning Comments (SMDC)
Subject: Unresolved questions regarding SMD/2019/0646 and SMD/2022/0014

Jane Curley (Mrs)
Senior Planning Officer (Majors & Commercial)
Mobile 07794 768397

From: John Williams
Sent: Monday, September 4, 2023 5:37 PM
To: Curley, Jane
Cc: Haywood, Ben (SMDC)
Subject: Unresolved questions regarding SMD/2019/0646 and SMD/2022/0014

Dear Mrs Curley

At your earliest convenience, can you please answer the following questions in relation to the proposed development in the former Moneystone Quarry. Planning applications SMD/2019/0646 (0646), and SMD/2022/0014 (0014) apply.

Please treat this letter as an objection to the each of the above planning applications.

1. Since the 0646 proposed lodges are in fact differently clad caravans without wheels, please can you confirm that a license been applied for, or already granted, under the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 for the construction of Moneystone Park?
2. Can you please confirm that 0646 will be fully compliant with the follow documents "Caravan and tent fire precautions [can be found in] BS 5576,80 circular 14/89 Model Standards 81, and BRE IP 15/91.82"?
3. Since protection from rock falls, by the use of rock traps, is an integral part of 0646's safety measures, can you please supply the construction detail for these traps, their locations on site and what types of rock fall they are designed to retain?
4. Can you please confirm that the planned rock traps in 0646 will safely retain a full collapse of any of the rock slopes that surround the quarry 3 lake?
5. 0646 Safety fencing: What preventative measures are to be provided to stop people (drunken lads in particular) from;

- a) climbing the rock faces,
 - b) climbing on the road bridge,
 - c) entering the bund area and 0014 spillway,
 - d) entering into the Whiston Eaves SSSI?
6. What safety barriers are to be provided in 0646 to prevent vehicles leaving the roads and falling into the Quarry 3's deep cold water lake, or from hitting a lodge, or lodges and causing them to also fall into the lake?
7. What safety measures are intended in 0646 to prevent children climbing over lodge balconies and falling onto steep slopes and then rolling in the deep, cold water lake of Quarry 3?
8. In 0646 what methods and materials will be used to secure the lodges to the rockface when partially over slopes, particularly above the deep cold water lake of Quarry 3?
9. The LLFA have requested more detailed drainage proposals for 0646. Have these been provided?
10. In 0646, what safety/life saving measures are to be provided along the length of the Churnet river that bounds the site?
11. In Abbeydale's first (now withdrawn) report, they concluded that reducing water depth to between 1.5 and 2.0 metres would improve slope stability - not to mention safety, why was this safety measure initially 'agreed' with the applicant, subsequently dropped from the 0646 application?
12. There is currently no provision for Electric Vehicle charge points in either the proposed car parks or by the proposed lodges. Has the applicant been approached to correct this serious omission in 0646?
13. SMDC currently has no renewal policy for owner(s) to replace tired and damaged lodges with new ones as is custom and practice with other LPAs. Why is this policy omission being allowed to continue?
14. 0646 drawing 1733-MS-950-Indicative Bridge Image is very misleading. SMDC must request a more suitable image for posting on the SMDC planning website?
15. 0646 drawing 1733-MS-815 Proposed Q3 Bridge the road surfacing detail is missing. This important detail should be added to the application and then reposted on the SMDC planning website?
16. Regarding the 0646 footbridge, the 1.5m high sides of the footbridge should be raised to 2m as the lower sides as the sides could be easily climbed. The detail on the plan should be amended and then reposted on the SMDC planning website?
17. The wooden footpath surface of the 0646 footbridge isn't a suitable material for the job as it is not durable and would be susceptible to ice formation in the winter. The detail on the plan should be amended and then reposted on the SMDC planning website?
18. 0646 drawings 5457-JPG-SW-ZZ-DR-S-1600 BRIDGE ELEVATION + SECTION: - the longitudinal support detail for the footbridge does not match that of drawing 1733-MS-815 Proposed Q3 Bridge. The detail on the plan should be amended and then reposted on the SMDC planning website?
19. In the NPPF Review there is a requirement to "Build Beautiful, Build Better". The planned lodges in 0646 are described as a luxury product in the application, when in fact they are disguised caravans. Luxury lodges these days contain jacuzzis and other modern conveniences. This application does not. The specification for the lodges should therefore be upgraded and detail posted on the SMDC website?

Yours Sincerely

John Williams

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>
