

THISTLEBERRY RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

Response to Inspector's queries for Newcastle-under-Lyme Local Plan

MATTER TEN – SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT, CLIMATE CHANGE AND RURAL MATTERS

10.1 Not sure. Some might be more appropriate than others. Some Rural Centres designated have no plan for development or land allocated. Is this related to a lack of need or a negotiated agreement?

10.2 (a) No idea what this might mean.

10.2 (b-c) Don't know. This might be for the Inspector to adjudicate.

10.3 (a) air pollution in some parts of the borough is a serious concern, particularly the area around the now closed landfill site. Whilst odours were the main priority, particulates which are more injurious to long term health seemed to have been ignored, even though this was highlighted by the Lepus report. The amount of development proposed in this plan will exacerbate this problem.

10.3 (b) Flooding is an increasing issue in this borough with increased rainfall. These are the areas where land is relatively cheap so this is often where development takes place. In Thistleberry more than 500 houses have been built on a former floodplain (with another 124 homes proposed in the plan to follow). So not sure what 'sequential' means here.

10.3 (c) Yes. The Lyme Brook which surrounds the Town is a recipient of sewage (large amounts) being pumped into it from the various pumping stations around it. (See the River's Trust data). The increased housing development will not improve matters.

10.3 (d) Don't know. The drainage system in the borough is Victorian in age and capacity. There appeared to be no plan in the Draft Plan to update this. Should it be left to the developer to do this? Waste water etc is pumped from the large housing development in Thistleberry.

10.3 (e) Don't know. The green and pleasant space in Thistleberry has deteriorated since 2019. It has also taken the TRA 17 years to prove the status of a customary right of way which had been encroached upon by three households who moved their fences up to 15 feet into the middle of the path. Although the PINS Inspector Issued an Order for its status as a right of way and its width, the path has still not been entered on the SCC Definitive Map of Rights of Way, and the fences remain in the middle of it. The NBC

did not help and compounded the issue by inviting the householders to apply for a change of use from public open space to private gardens, and not cutting back the vegetation – which it had done in the past. The SCC has a backlog of Rights of Way applications and bridleways which would not take more than 100 years to adjudicate. The path in question in Thistleberry would have and will contribute to a Green Corridor linking the wetland area and the housing estate at Burgess Brook to Gallowstree Lane and beyond. Not least it is a short cut to a local pub on Gallowstree Lane.

10.3.(f) Don't know what this actually means or how it works. It seems to be on a par with the concept of 'beautiful buildings' and 'good design'.

10.3 (g) Don't know. Probably not. In practical terms trees (including TPOs), historic hedgerows and woodlands have never been an issue for developers. If they are in the way, they are removed.

10.3 (h) Don't know but all are in need of protection. In Thistleberry an historic stone wall was removed by a developer because it was 'old' and the stone was removed. This was not part of the approved plan which stated that part of the wall should remain and the demolished section (removed to provide a visibility splay) should be replaced to match the remaining part. Instead a metal crash barrier was installed. Both the SCC and the NBC did not enforce the matter and important maps were 'mislaid' by NBC. The SCC refused to reinstate the wall.

10.3 (i) Not clear. don't know.

10.3 (j) Don't know. This would be for the Inspector to decide.

10.4 (a) Don't know. The landfill site in Thistleberry was clearly not assessed. If it was then the assessment was far from accurate in terms of health and well-being. Similarly for the sewage and pumping stations etc.. Should these decisions be left up to the LPA and Elected Officers who possibly have a vested interest to approve a development?

10.4 (b) Yes if a policy is in place for design then it should apply to all, since precedence is often used in planning decisions. It should be for the Inspector to decide re omissions from the policy.

10.4 (c) Don't know.

10.4 (d) Don't know. What is a 'significant adverse'. Uncertain why 10% has been identified.

Chair

TRA

29 April 2025