

STAPENHILL PARISH COUNCIL

www.stapenhillparishcouncil.gov.uk
25 Malvern Street, Stapenhill,
DE15 9DY

Date: 09/01/2020

Emily Summers
Development Control
East Staffordshire Borough Council
Burton upon Trent

Re: Fivelands Planning Application P/2019/01465

As a result of the recent meeting of the Parish Council to discuss the implications of the Fivelands Development Application P/2019/01465, it was resolved that the councillors concerns and objections shall be communicated to the ESBC Planning Department. The following items are raised as objections to the application, without limitation, for your attention.

- 1. PEDESTRIAN PATHWAY TO ROSLISTON ROAD NOW NOT INCLUDED.** The application fails to include the provision of a pedestrian pathway from the south end of the development onto Rosliston Road. This provision, which accords with the requirements of the ESBC Local Plan and the Stapenhill Neighbourhood Plan, was clearly shown on the Outline Planning Application P/2018/01451. This route currently exists into the Fivelands Allotments site viz. 'Access is gained through a locked gate set back from Rosliston Road with a track leading to the main area of the site'¹. This omission has the effect of disregarding the policy outlined in ST1 ("The provision of new and improved cycle and pedestrian routes will be supported where planning permission is required for these works...") of the Neighbourhood Plan, which is concerned with promoting sustainable transport options such as cycle and pedestrian routes to discourage use of the private car for short journeys. ST1 is not even mentioned in the developer's Design, Access & Planning document. This is particularly objectionable to the Parish Council since both a doctor's surgery (Fyfield Road Medical Centre), a veterinary surgery, a dentist's surgery and a selection of shops are all located to the south of the development and along Rosliston Road. The lack of such a pedestrian pathway linking to these facilities on Rosliston Road would increase the distance appreciably (960 metres) to go via the Main Street Access Road and potentially lead to increased car usage with all its congestion, air pollution and health problems. To refer to the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 section 8, paragraph 91, this repeatedly gives emphasis to the provision of safe routes to encourage walking and cycling for health and social interaction.
- 2. NATIONAL FOREST PLANTING ONLY 6% INSTEAD OF 20%.** The National Forest Planting area shown in the Design, Access & Planning document is considerably short of the amount required for the development site size. Stapenhill Parish is designated as part of the National Forest, and the required amount of planting to conform with SP26 ('Developments shall contribute towards the creation of the Forest by providing on-site or nearby landscaping that meets the National Forest development planting guidelines')

of the ESBC Local Plan, is 20% of the total site area (given as 1.88 ha, or 18800sqm in the developer's application form to ESBC). The Forest planting area is therefore 3760sqm. The area of Forest planting provided by the application is only a paltry 6% (given by the Design access & Planning document section 3), which equates to 1128m², leaving a shortfall of 14% of that required to conform to SP26. This shortfall of 14% equates to an area of 2632m². Whilst it is noted that the application claims to provide an additional area of semi/natural greenspace on the site, most of this is already present as part of the site's topography, and cannot be considered as having equal weighting to Forest planting with all its ecological and environmental benefits. The attenuation tanks and attenuation basin is already a sustainable drainage requirement of the site, and though acting as greenspace, should not be traded for Forest planting requirements. Councillors believe that the number of dwellings on the site should be revisited to improve the percentage of Forest planting to a level closer to that required by the Local Plan, and that the position of this parish as part of the National Forest should not be undermined by totally inadequate levels of Forest planting in new developments. Councillors also believe that the current UK Government concerns regarding global warming and the environment with its emphasis on greatly enhanced levels of tree planting should not be so lightly disregarded in applications for new development. It is also noted by Councillors that the 'missing' pedestrian footway to Rosliston Road, detailed in the outline plan and in item 1 above, would also contribute about a further 200 m² of woodland planting/greenspace to the shortfall in the National Forest planting requirements, and should be re-included into the site. Councillors have also noted that it can be shown by example that a nominal reduction of four dwelling plots would enable an increase in the area available for Forest planting of approximately 1000sqm. This coupled with the pedestrian way to Rosliston Road, would result in a total area available for Forest planting of 1128sqm + 200sqm + 1000sqm = 2328sqm, which is 62% of the required amount of planting, or 12.4% of the site area.

3. **INAPPROPRIATE OVER-DEVELOPMENT OF SITE.** The Parish Council considers that an increase in the number of dwellings from 49 to 64 is an example of inappropriate over-development of the site. The outline plan consisting of 49 dwellings, would equate to a dwelling density, on the 1.59ha developable area given, of 31 dwellings per hectare. The density with 64 dwellings on the same developable area gives 40 dwellings per hectare, an increase in density of 29%. The Parish Council considers this to be an unacceptably large increase, which would be to the detriment in appearance and quality of the development with its noticeably regimented groups of dwellings and its non-conformity with Forest planting levels. Councillors believe that this over-development coupled with the massive shortfall in National Forest planting should be re-visited by the applicant to enable a more acceptable scheme to be produced. Again for example a reduction in the number of dwellings by 8 would give 56 dwellings, a site density of 35 dwellings per hectare, whilst freeing up an extra 2000sqm to give a total Forest planting area of 3328sqm, which is 86% of the required level, or 17% of the site area.
4. **INCREASED LEVELS OF CONGESTION AND AIR POLLUTION.** Councillors have noted the increasing queues of vehicles backing up Main Street, Rosliston Road and Stanton Road in the peak hours, at the week and weekends. On many occasions these queues will tail back along these roads for many hundreds of metres. It is noted that the Transport Statement document asserts that the addition of vehicles from the development onto Main Street, will make little difference to the vehicle numbers, completely misses the point that at peak times the vehicles are either stationary or moving at a crawl along the road. This means that they will also back up along Fivlands Road, as is now evident for vehicles trying to join Rosliston Road and Main

Street from the other side streets. The assessment given in the Transport Statement document is considered to be completely unrealistic in that it gives no consideration of the current traffic conditions. Councillors consider that additional vehicles from this development will also contribute to increasing levels of air pollution along Main Street that are already higher due to the additional vehicle numbers from other housing developments further along Rosliston Road. Councillors have already noted the disastrous effect of these pressures from other large housing developments along Rosliston Road such as: Drakelow Park (100 houses now, several hundred more in the future), Drakelow HGV Depot which now puts several dozen heavy goods vehicles onto Rosliston Road every day and night (they cannot go any other route to the A38 or A444), Bluebell Woods housing development with 70+ houses on Rosliston Road South completed last year, the new housing on the old garage site near the Crown Inn on Rosliston Road, the planned new housing development at the rear of the Londis supermarket near the Rosliston Road Allotments, the new housing on Main Street opposite the Barley Mow public house and others.

5. **INCREASED LEVELS OF ROAD HAZARDS.** Councillors also consider that additional vehicles from the development contributing to the high density of vehicles already on Main Street in the area of Fivelands Road will lead to an increase in the number of traffic related accidents. Parking on the West side of Main Street and the parking on Fivelands Road, restricting the width for passing vehicles in both cases gives restricted sighting for pedestrians, including schoolchildren, crossing the road. There is no zebra crossing in this area, and there have been many near misses, especially with schoolchildren. It is also noted that the effectiveness of the traffic calming speed humps in Main Street, either side of the Fivelands Road junction, is often appreciably reduced, as any observation will attest. Pedestrians, many of whom will be schoolchildren who have walked over the Ferry Bridge from Burton town on their way up to Paulet High School. They will be crossing the road in the morning rush hour with northbound vehicles crawling along the centre of the road past the parked cars on Main Street, which reduces sighting distances and awareness, coupled with vehicles travelling at speed along in a southbound direction, unhindered by ineffective speed humps near to Fivelands Road, make for an increasingly dangerous activity.
6. **LACK OF FUNDING FOR CHANGES TO HIGHWAY INFRASTRUCTURE.** Councillors are also concerned as to there being no indication as to whether any funding will be made available for the introduction of any necessary changes to the Highway infrastructure to alleviate problems associated with inadequate road width, inappropriate vehicle parking, inadequate parking restrictions and pedestrians struggling to cross Main Street safely.
7. **INCREASED STRAIN ON ALREADY VERY STRETCHED LOCAL FACILITIES.** Councillors are very concerned that this development with its large number of dwellings will put even more strain on the capacity of local facilities such as doctors, dentists, schools, nurseries, police, and fire and ambulance services. Many of these are already at full capacity, which will inevitably lead to further distances to access services with the resultant additional car usage and increases in traffic congestion and air pollution.
8. **INSUFFICIENT INVESTIGATION OF SITE ECOLOGY & ARCHAEOLOGY.** Concerns have been expressed to Councillors that the Archaeological and Ecological surveys appear to be some years out of date. It is believed that previous surveys have omitted mature and other trees that are currently present on the development site, which should be included in any plans. In light of the Archaeological evidence relating to the Saxon

burial remains, and the recent comments expressed by the County Archaeologist, Councillors believe that further trial investigation trenches should be employed in the parts of the site that are of most interest and concern.

9. **IRREVERSIBLE DAMAGE TO WILDLIFE ON SITE.** The allotments site currently supports a large diversity of local wildlife such as badgers and their setts, bats, foxes, hedgehogs, butterflies and many wild birds (including protected species). This may be due in part to its topography and continual usage as allotments over a period of about 90+ years. Local residents and Councillors are very concerned that this development in its present form will have a disastrous effect on this wildlife, especially if the intended level of Forest planting is at such a low percentage level of only 6%. Again Councillors believe that these aspects of the development should be re-visited by the applicant to obtain a better environmental and ecological outcome, where such a beneficial legacy is maintained right at the very heart of the parish.

10. **DAMAGING EFFECTS OF NO S106 FUNDING.** The previous outline planning application was concerned with a mix of 49 dwellings that were to be for private sale. This would have consequently attracted S106 funding for the improvement of much stretched local facilities such as recreational and sport areas, improved safe cycle and pedestrian routes and children's play areas. Councillors are concerned that the change on the application to dwellings that are considered as 'social' housing, will no longer provide any S106 funding, even though the occupants of such dwellings will still, through no fault of their own, cause even greater pressure on already overstretched local facilities. Councillors have already noted the disastrous effect of these pressures from other large housing developments along Rosliston Road such as: Drakelow Park (100 houses now, several hundred more in the future), and the Bluebell Woods housing development on Rosliston Road South completed last year, which are just outside of the ESBC area and out of the County, and as such make no contribution to accommodating or alleviating these pressures.

In relation to the above concerns and objections, Stapenhill Parish Council requests a site meeting of Parish and Borough Ward Councillors with both a representative the ESBC Planning Department and the Developer, to discuss our concerns and objections with the application. The Parish Council hopes that an agreeable way forward can be established that takes account of the Council's concerns and provides a high quality mixed development that is sympathetic to the area, not only ensuring a sustainable environment for the future, but also building on the site's diverse ecological inheritance from the past.

We look forward to your response.

Kind Regards

Dave Briggs
Stapenhill Parish Clerk
07799824061
clerk.stapenhillpc@outlook.com