

From: planningcomments@staffs Moorlands.gov.uk
To: [Planning Comments \(SMDC\)](#)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access
Date: 12 October 2023 08:25:49

Application Reference No. : SMD/2023/0489

Site Address: Land To Rear Of Rosedale 403 Cheadle Road Cheddleton Staffordshire ST13 7BH

Comments by: V Millar

From:

407

Cheadle Road

Cheddleton

Leek

Staffordshire Moorlands

ST13 7BH

Phone:

Email:

Submission: Objection

Comments: General

At the planning committee in August 2023 in relation to the original application SM/2021/0155, all of the raised objections based on the environmental and ecological concerns were not considered relevant to reject the application. I would like to re-emphasise all concerns around the loss of natural habitat for the identified animal, insect and plant species with the proposed plans. The introduction into the fields behind the paddock area would not detract from the destruction and disruption to natural habitats. The construction itself would create disruption and likely result in the non-return of species already evidenced in the area: great crested newts, bats, hedgehogs, buzzards, lapwings etc..

Response to the planning, design & access statement

Paragraph 1.3 indicates how the submission demonstrates the development would provide clear social, economic and environmental benefits in relation to the provision of new housing within an accessible and sustainable locations especially at a time of chronic under supply. The application gives no detail as to how this will be achieved, with three luxury four bedroom homes with garages. Sustainable housing and chronic under supply are not phrases associated with the development of large, luxury, expensive housing on private windfall sites, but rather for a specific demographic.

would be no adverse harm upon the character and appearance of the application site & not be detrimental to highways safety or harm any established ecological interests. the harm would be on the environment and species therein but also of the residents along the whole of the Cheadle Road between Heath Farm and Folly Lane. The amount of disruption caused by the construction itself will be detrimental to residents and those using the A520 by creating an unsafe environment for a significant amount of time. The access is only via the A520 via the side of Rosedale, this will need to be cleared to create the route into the site for the main build to take place. Recent home improvements at a dwelling on Cheadle Road, with work vehicles having to be parked on the roadside by the dwelling has caused unsafe pavement access and traffic congestion (it is a 50 mile an hour road) as vehicles have to pass parked work vehicles and/or delivery vehicles. This would be exacerbated with the size of the construction site being proposed with only the single narrow access point in and out of the site. As well as the point being so close to an occupied family dwelling.

3.0 Proposal

The plan has changed from four to three, four bedroom dwellings each with a garage and driveway and there is now the inclusion of a described turning area for delivery vehicles. The positioning of two out of the three plots has changed and it looks that the dwellings have moved to the very boundary of the plot. What has not changed is the site is still accessed via a single in/out point at the left side of Rosedale (looking at the plan) which requires the demolish of the garage attached to Rosedale.

It is noted, nowhere on the plans is there the inclusion of the permitted erection of a dwelling (SMD/2020/0034) next to what is 401 Cheadle road. It shows the garage that was there, but this has been demolished and

foundations are laid. This means the access point being proposed is not appropriately impact assessed and the access in/out of the site to the back of Rosedale becomes more restrictive in both visibility. It also adds to the concerns raised around the number of bins in that area for collections, restoring pavement access and creating obstacles/visibility restrictions. It also means there is an impact of vehicles passing both Rosedale but the new dwelling from both residents' vehicles but also other vehicles to the site, EG. Construction, delivery, postal, visitors, others.

The existing southern access would be retained to serve Rosedale and a replacement garage would be provided within the curtilage for the host building. The size of this egress is extremely narrow and would have detrimental impact both on the property as an access route and given the condition of Rosedale. There is no indication in the plans to address what was raised by a committee member as to the impacts on Rosedale dwelling itself. The garage may provide parking but this would have an impact on residents. It is noted the property is let, but any resident would be impacted by the construction itself.

4.0 Policy

Para 4.3 states, refers to the local authorities housing commitments and highlights sections within it (1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 11 & 12) and seeks to indicate that this planning application goes towards addressing them and feeds into the quota of the new supply of housing.

5.0 Assessment

Para 5.2 there is no evidence from this planning application that it will contribute positively to the social, economic and environmental improvement of the Staffordshire Moorlands.

Para 5.3 the use of windfall sites within development boundaries is a private gain not a valid approach to reducing the gap in the housing stock when it's to build three four bedroom dwellings. The houses are not social housing but to attract a specific demographic of buyer.

Para 5.4 numerous local services, facilities and employment opportunities on offer within the village. The village of Cheddleton has limited to no services and facilities, with the only dentist having closed and access to all health facilities now either in Werrington, Leek or Cheadle. I am also unaware of the employment opportunities that are being referenced that would entice persons who can afford four-bedroom properties.

Para 5.8 & 5.9 In conclusion it is considered that the reduction in the number of properties from four to three and the resultant increase in space between as well as a slightly revised layout adequately and amendments to the overall design and appearance adequately address the previous concerns regarding scale, layout, siting and design. We dispute this claim as the issues identified have not been sufficiently addressed by removing one dwelling and adjusting the positions of the remaining ones.

Para 5.10 it is disputed that the plan will be sufficient size to provide satisfactory levels of amenity for future occupiers of the dwellings. The dwellings are four bedroomed. Noting how properties are occupied in this day and age, garages are seldom if ever used for storing cars. There should also be serious consideration given to the fact that as families grow and older children remain due to unaffordable housing, high interest rates, they then have their own cars and subsequent social gatherings of their friends. The issues of accessibility and current and future occupancy would not be sufficient.

Para 5.11 the levels of light pollution would be increased even more, as the pollution from Pointon's park is significant. As well as light and noise pollution in connection to the factory itself, both from HGV vehicles and those of the workers. These dwellings would add to the levels of pollution if permitted but also if permitted would suffer from the existing pollution.

Para 5.12 any building will have an impact on existing dwellings and to claim otherwise is insulting. There is no indication of how run-off rainwater will be handled given the buildings will reduce the soak away. Run-off water from the drive ways will go into the gardens of existing properties, which already has a natural run-off stream (field and 411) which is water logged in the winter. This has potential to cause detrimental damage to existing properties.

Para 5.13 the plan may have pushed dwellings back but this does not give more land to either side of Rosedale to allow access to the proposed site or for the garage of Rosedale. In-fact the lack of inclusion of the already permitted new dwelling (401) means the plan is flawed.

Para 5.14 to 5.15 ; the issue of access and parking have already been indicated in the above, but for clarity. The access point is still not sufficient. On bin days it will be blocked for both occupiers and those using the pavements. Noting now only three dwellings, that still means six bins every fortnight, not including those for Rosedale which will now be on the opposite entrance for that dwelling. To note current residents of Rosedale leave bins out days beyond collection, creating obstacles for users of the pavement and visibility along the road.

The turning area proposed on the site in reality will likely be used as additional parking spaces for residents and their visitors. The applicant would argue otherwise, but if permission is granted and site is built, there is nothing that could obligate the residents to not park in these areas. The argument is this would also avoid access issues of utility vehicles, but the new dwelling at 401 has not been included in any impact assessment or considerations, which would make the access point restricted by width of vehicular access itself but also visibility.

Para 5.16 ; 5.18 ; I would argue the ;titled balance; approach does not apply as the benefits of the proposal do not outweigh the specific harms identified, namely the detrimental effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the local areas contrary to the H1 ;New Housing Development; of the local plan. The lack of accurate plans to reflect other planned activity in the site around accessibility shows an ineffective proposal and it should be rejected with immediate effect.

6.0 Conclusion

Para 6.1 ; references good access to services, facilities and employment opportunities provided by the village, but does not indicate what these are to fully apply them to the application, given as above, there are no services, facilities or employment opportunities.

Para 6.2 ; I would argue that the sue of windfall sites is more for the economic betterment of the individual not to plug a gap in the housing supply.

Para 6.3 ; the proposal would not contribute modestly or otherwise to the housing land supply as these are not helping the gap in social housing but adding luxury homes to the market. Currently on the same road there are still two similar sized properties on the market which were for sale at the time of the first planning committee meeting. They are indicative of the current housing market and I would argue building any new luxury homes at this time would be negligent.

Para 6.4 ; the above objection counts towards why the proposal does NOT provide social and economic benefits either once built or during the supply chain. There is no evidence this is positive and would in fact detract from the area during the build and could cause significant impacts on road safety.

Para 6.5 ; It is argued that the provisions of policies SS, SS8, DC1, DC3, H1 and NE1 are being interpreted and applied to support the application without full and transparent impact assessment. The lack of the details of the permitted dwelling at 401 is evidence of this.

7.0 Design & Access Statement

Use 7.1 ; it is not predominantly residential when the waste disposal factory has been permitted to extend and takes up a significant amount of land area. This has not been included in any aspect of the application, that can be seen.

7.2 Amount ; the number of dwellings is irrelevant if the other aspects of the harm have not been addressed appropriately and elements of other activity have not been included.

7.3 Layout ; for reasons already indicated the layout with the same access point means the issues have not been adequately addressed nor transparently assessed with the lack of the dwelling at 401. The lack of clarity on how rain water run-off will be handled is detrimental to existing properties. The small soakaways indicated on plans would not be sufficient for the new buildings let alone the existing properties.

7.4 Scale ; the size of existing properties varies and the average is not the same as those proposed.

7.5 Landscaping ; it states existing would be retained. Changes prior to the initial permission were made, removing trees and hedges. With the dwellings moving closer to the boundary with the field that can;t be built

on, it is not clear how they will be retained or protected during construction, those with existing properties or the field boundaries.

7.6 Appearance ¿ it will dramatically alter the appearance of the site. The oks has been built but it has affected the appearance of the location, regardless of material used.

7.7 Access ¿ all of the above addresses access. There is no improvement, the plan does not include plans at 401, there is no indication of how bins will be handled/stored to avoid obstruction. It is a 50 mile an hour road, with motorists often going faster. Increased dwellings mean, more vehicles to service and deliver to the properties providing greater chance of incident on the A520.

I ask that you reject this application based on it not having addressed the access issues from the committee in August 2023; that the plan has not fully included all activity in the area which adds more concerns to the access of proposals (401), and whilst it may not be at the forefront, the environmental issues of removing green land as a natural soak-away means the current residents face damage / harm to their properties.

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>
