
From: planningcomments@staffs Moorlands.gov.uk
Sent: 18 September 2025 20:58
To: Planning Comments (SMDC)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access

Categories:

Application Reference No. : SMD/2025/0380 Site Address: Land adjacent to High View Sutherland Road Longsdon
Staffordshire ST9 9QD Stoke On Trent Comments by: Robert Copeland

From:

Shrubbs Hill Cottage
Sutherland Road
Longsdon
Leek
Staffordshire
st9 9qd

Phone:

Email:

Submission: Objection

Comments: To Whom It May Concern,

Subject: Formal Objection to Planning Application & Agricultural Land Adjacent to High View, Sutherland Road, ST9 9QD

I am writing to formally object to the current planning proposal concerning the parcel of land adjacent to High View on Sutherland Road, postcode ST9 9QD. My objection is based on multiple material considerations, including land designation, infrastructure concerns, traffic safety, and environmental impact. I respectfully request that this application be refused in accordance with national and local planning policy.

1. Land Designation and Planning History

The land in question is designated as agricultural, not residential or gardening land, as inaccurately cited in the current proposal. This distinction is critical under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, which restricts development on agricultural land unless exceptional circumstances apply. Previous applications for residential development on this site were refused on this basis.

Furthermore, retrospective planning permission was previously granted for an access opening explicitly for agricultural use. The current proposal appears to be part of a piecemeal development strategy, which risks undermining the integrity of the planning process. This concern is echoed in *Gladman Developments Ltd v Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government* [2020] EWHC 518 (Admin), where the High Court reaffirmed that planning decisions must align with the development plan unless material considerations clearly justify otherwise.

2. Infrastructure and Drainage Concerns

The application lacks sufficient detail regarding waste management infrastructure. There are no public drainage systems in the immediate vicinity, and the site lies on a steep incline with a retaining wall approximately 5 feet from the public highway. The absence of detailed plans for a septic tank and soakaway system is concerning.

According to Building Regulations Part H, septic tanks must be used in conjunction with a drainage field, the tank must be located at least 7 metres from any dwelling and the drainage field must be at least 15 metres from building. The proposed layout appears to point to the drainage field been right by the wall that is the properties boundary to the highway, posing a risk of effluent seepage onto the carriageway, which could result in environmental contamination and public health hazards as well as an awful smell.

3. Highway Safety and Traffic Impact

The proposed access point is directly opposite my property, where we are required to park two vehicles on the public road due to the absence of a private driveway. The increased traffic from a new residential property would exacerbate congestion and may lead to disputes over roadside parking.

Moreover, the site is situated near the junction with Limes Avenue, a known commuter route, and forms part of a busy cut-through to Cheddleton. This road already accommodates significant visitor traffic to Deep Hayes Country Park, the canals, and local walking trails. Additional vehicular movement would compromise highway safety and contravene Chapter 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which promotes sustainable transport and minimises traffic hazards.

4. Environmental and Ecological Impact

The land in question forms part of the green belt surrounding the village and supports a diverse range of wildlife, including rabbits, foxes, badgers, and deer. Development on this site would disrupt the ecological balance and contravene Chapter 15 of the NPPF, which mandates the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment.

The planning authority also has a statutory duty under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 to consider the impact of development on protected species and habitats. The loss of this habitat would be irreversible and detrimental to the biodiversity of the area.

5. Misrepresentation and Public Trust

When we purchased our property, solicitor searches confirmed that the land across the road was classified as agricultural and not eligible for residential development. This assurance was a material factor in our decision to proceed with the purchase. The current application contradicts this classification and undermines public trust in the planning system.

Conclusion

In light of the above, I respectfully urge the planning authority to reject this application. The proposal conflicts with national and local planning policies, poses environmental and infrastructural risks, and threatens the character and safety of the surrounding area.

Thank you for considering my objection.

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>
