

From: planningcomments@staffs Moorlands.gov.uk
To: [Planning Comments \(SMDC\)](#)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access
Date: 04 March 2024 11:26:21

Application Reference No. : SMD/2021/0113

Site Address: Land At Bridge End Macclesfield Road Leek Staffordshire ST13 8LG

Comments by: Ross Ankers

From:

1

Bridge End
Leek
Leek
Staffordshire
ST13 8LG

Phone:

Email:

Submission: Objection

Comments: Objections to Proposals submitted under documents 2022-2683-06A CEMP (Track development) and Construction vehicle management plan (14.02.24)

I strongly object to the submitted proposals on the following grounds:

2022-2683-06A CEMP (Track development)

1. Parking amenity. At present the properties fronting the private track successfully manage the limited parking available through mutual co-operation and historic parking space assignment. The current parking provisions allows for on-track parking for 2-3 parking spaces per household (being 14 spaces), plus additional parking for visitors to the South end of the track (outside the factory) - which is frequently full from people attending events at the nearby cricket club, hockey club and football ground. The proposals allow for 6 on-track parking spaces, a reduction of over 50% (dismissing the spaces outside the factory as this is outside of the residents control). I was unable to find any parking provision guidance/ policy for Staffs Moorlands Planning, but in accordance with their sister Department (East Staffordshire Planning) the following provision should be allocated for any new development (the development of track being such): 1 Bedroom : 1 space + 1 space per 3 dwellings for visitors, 2 or 3 Bedrooms: 2 spaces, 4 or more Bedrooms :3 spaces. The existing properties are: 3x2 bedrooms, 1x 3 bedrooms, and 4x 4 bedrooms. Omitting the two off-street parking spaces available to 2 Bridge-end that would leave a required provision of 18 spaces. The proposals fall significantly short of this. I would like to note, being a private track there is no public right of access or parking: the first-come-first served rule does not apply.

2. Pavement: The proposals make no amenity for safe access for pedestrians to the 6th Northern most properties. At present pedestrian safeguarding is carried out through considerate parking and vehicle movement by the residents; being particularly cautious around school run times. The current parking layout (cars parked on both sides) acts as a natural speed limiter; vehicles are forced to slow down for fear of clipping cars along the route. The proposals would allow vehicles to travel much quicker along the track and pedestrians will have no choice but to walk in the road. With a significant increase in traffic along the track (a potential of an additional 22 vehicles + at peak times) this poses a real safety issues. The proposals also show no pavement north of the gates, so the problem becomes even worse for the new residents, who also have a blind corner to contend with.

3. Street lighting: the proposals show no street lighting. At present the track is illuminated at the northern end by a floodlight controlled by the resident: only through mutual agreement and co-operation are we afforded the security and safety of street lighting at night. The developer is proposing to increase traffic, speed up traffic, reduce safety for pedestrians, and open a private, well monitored track up to the public without making any provision for safety and security.

4. Bin storage: The proposals seek to provide 6m (length) of communal bin storage. The current provision

is 8m: a reduction of 4 bins: why should we have a reduction in our amenity on our private track to satisfy a developer?

5. Turning circle. At present a turning circle is maintained through mutual co-operation in front of the bin store: if the track is made 'public' to allow access for all traffic to reach the proposed development we shall lose the ability to control traffic and parking: are we all therefore expected to continue northwards along the track into the development and turn around at the north most point; to include all deliveries?

6. Loss of heritage surface: the track still features the original setts leading to the original front entrance to Bridge House (built 1836- known connections to the Brindley and W. Morris). These are an important part of the heritage of the site. The proposals seek to remove/ tarmac over them.

7. Surface water run off: At present a 700mm wide shallow gully to the Western boundary of the track helps to shed the surface run off away from the properties (some of which have thresholds lower than the track surface); the run-off from the track North of the track is significant and has been on a steep trajectory in recent years: a 300mm high concrete haunching runs across the Northern boundary of the track (in-front of the derelict gates) to divert water run-off towards the gully. These defences are under significant strain and require significant ongoing maintenance from the residents to keep our properties safe from flooding. The proposals seek to remove these defences and make no new provision for surface water collection and safe run off; the covering of the track with a non-permeable finish (tarmac) will only exacerbate the situation. We run the serious risk of our homes being flooded.

8. Bin collection/ emergency services: The Highways department has stated it will not be adopting the track following development; please can the Planning Department advise what happens should the developed track and new proposed 'private road' on the estate fall into a state of disrepair meaning utility vehicles can no longer access the properties? What provision shall be put in place to prevent the developer from selling off the plots leaving the new owners with no legal rights or responsibilities for its maintenance? (*the whole road from the A523 is private, not just in the estate as suggested). The same applies to snowy/ icy conditions: at present the track is un-accessible during snow conditions with residents parking outside the factory wall; and bins carted down to the Southern end of the track for emptying: will the new residents be expected to pull their bins all the way down?

Construction vehicle management plan.

The traffic management Plan confirms the developer is seeking to bring all construction traffic related to the development up the private track that fronts our properties. I have strong objections as follows:

9. Risk to existing services: There are several water services below the existing track (combined drains and surface water drains). the track is in a poor condition. I have serious concerns that heavy construction traffic could result in damage to the existing archaic systems with no provision for safeguarding/ replacement in the plans. Note: this is not an adopted track, so all maintenance currently lies with residents

10. The track is too narrow to accept heavy construction traffic whilst in its current amenity occupation: see items 1-8 above for loss amenity under the proposals)

11. The tracks condition is not suitable for heavy construction traffic, being partly un-metalled, and in part heritage surfacing: any access north of the track would require the demolition of the surface water defences (see point 7 above) placing our homes at immediate risk. Note again: this is not an adopted track, so all maintenance currently lies with residents

12. It is not unusual for developments of this kind to fail prior to completion: I have concerns that our track (and potentially homes) maybe adversely affected by the construction phase and maybe left in an unusable state with the construction works unfinished and the site abandoned (see Sugar Street, Rushton Spencer, as an example): as such any track development should be considered a pre-commencement condition (before work on house building). Same note again: this is not an adopted track, so all maintenance currently lies with residents; what happens if the developer goes bust and we're left with no access at all?

Notwithstanding all of the above, I still argue that the developer has no rights along the track, and no rights to develop any of the land along, or bounding the track and shall continue to pursue this as a civil matter and do not give my permission. I understand this is outside of the Planning Authority's jurisdiction, but as a matter of practicality would consider the current proposals undevelopable whilst matters of access for construction and

occupancy are unresolved furthering my argument for any matters relating to this to be considered a pre-commencement item. I further add that since the deferral of application following the last committee the developer has made no attempts to liaise with the community over this matter, showing again their lack of appreciation, or care, of the impact this development will have on our close-nit community: the reduction of amenity and lack of understanding of the existing site is a direct result of the developer's lack of liaison.

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>
