
From: David Robins <david.robins@hotmail.co.uk>
Sent: 05 April 2024 11:00
To: Planning Comments (SMDC)
Subject: SMD/2024/0108 - ROSEHILL ALTON ST104AY

From;- David Robins
Nabb Cottage Nabb Lane Alton ST10 4AY

I write to object to the above application for two, additional, holiday chalets on the grounds that:-

*My property is situated some forty metres from Rosehill along Nabb Lane, the lane being about three metres wide. I am fully aware of the problems caused at the lane's junction with Denstone Lane, adjacent to my house, particularly now with the volume of "sat-nav" drivers using Nabb Lane and the junction being only a few metres away from the very difficult junction of the B5032 (Denstone Lane), Saltersford Lane and the road to Alton Towers especially when large coaches are arriving and leaving the theme park simultaneously and also meeting forty-foot articulated vehicles travelling between local factories on this stretch the B5032. The introduction of further traffic onto Nabb Lane can only exacerbate the situation. I would, respectfully, suggest that the Highways Agency have not sat at these junctions on a busy morning in the high season.

* I do not consider that further "holiday" accommodation is essentially needed in this area as this is a rural area and holiday chalets, in my opinion, do not support rural sustainability (SS10). There are, already, dozens of "holiday beds" available in the village area and hundreds on the local theme park.

* I believe that the Local Plan, DC1, states that new developments should be of a high quality and add value to the local area. I fail to see how a group of (removeable?) wooden buildings can comply with this regulation. Particularly as the site is situated on a rural lane that has changed little in over two hundred years and is one of the few areas, in the historic village of Alton, that has not in recent years been ruined by unsympathetic development and "garden-grabbing". The proposed site is also situated between two traditional, vernacular style, listed, properties and next to a house built by the, then, local authority for a blinded hero from the 1st World War. Surely a commercial development, in this location (and where will it stop?) would be totally out of keeping with the area. I understand that a previous and similar application, 2023/0226, has earlier been refused.

In view of the above this application should be refused

David Robins