

Burnett, James

From: planning@staffmoorlands.gov.uk
Sent: Monday, March 28, 2016 8:41 PM
To: Planning (SMDC)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access

Application Reference No. : SMD/2015/0736

Site Address: Land West Of Heath House Lane And North Of UTTOXETER ROAD LOWER TEAN STAFFORDSHIRE

Comments by: JACQUELINE RUSHTON

From: JACQUELINE RUSHTON

6 Heath House Lane

Team

Team

STOKE-ON-TRENT

STAFFORDSHIRE

ST10 4LP

Phone: +

Email:

Submission: Objection

Comments: 1. I am responding to the submission of further comments from JMW Planning LTD from 26/1/16, and comments made by Mr Jason Bloor at Checkley Parish Council Meeting on 15/12/2015.

2. The comments made by JMW Planning on 26/1/2016, appear to be arguing the case that as the Council has previously allowed the development of the current housing by Wimpey Homes in the 1960s, then as that clearly had an impact upon the listed buildings and the scheduled monument; It clearly gives credence to the argument that development could be allowed now, as the damage has already been done. Fortunately, planning and attitudes have moved on since 1965, and much more care and consideration is given to protecting heritage. I have no doubt that if Wimpey Homes applied to build the same estate today, it would be refused. One only has to look locally for planning and development horrors of the 1960 and 1970 decades to see that we have moved on considerably. Two of the listed buildings were not even listed until the 1980s. The Bowl Barrow actually first scheduled on 1st of November 1967, after planning permission had been granted for the Wimpey Development. We need to recognise the damage we have done in the past, learn from it, and not repeat it.

3. JMW Planning also states that the outline planning application was only submitted because the Council identified this as a potentially suitable housing site. The operational word here; is potentially. This site was up for consultation with the public, and to be discussed and decided by the Council. The results of this decision are due in June 2016. From the public consultation, and documents within the public domain. It would be clear for JMW Planning to see that there was considerable local public opposition to this as an allocated housing site. This opposition clearly voiced concerns about traffic/access issues, and also regarding the sites proximity to a scheduled monument. I do not believe that the Council invited applications for outline planning permission by identifying it as a potential building site, to be consulted upon. It may have been more prudent to see if it was actually later designated as a site suitable for building under The Local Plan.

4. JMW Planning mentions an appeal by Barwood Strategic Ltd . This is mentioned in terms of ascertaining the balance between harm caused to a Grade 1 registered park, and a Conservation area, and the benefit of being able to provide homes, including affordable homes, on a site without significant delay. In this case, the appeal was allowed in favour of Barwood, as The Secretary of State agreed that the benefits of the development outweighed the harm. However there are considerable differences between that development and this planning application.

5. Firstly Historic England in the Barwood case concluded that the harm caused to the heritage assets would be less than substantial. In this case Historic England states per Ian George Inspector of Ancient Monuments on document submitted on 10/3/16; Granting this development permission would lead to substantial harm to the

historic environment. The setting of the Scheduled round barrow would be permanently harmed. The levels of harm caused are substantially greater than in the appeal case which JMW Planning chooses to use as an example.

6. Secondly, this was an application for up to 250 dwellings, a considerable number of new homes, including affordable dwellings. This represents a far more substantial contribution to our housing stock, than 20 houses in a small village. This development was on the edge of Burton-On-Trent with good transport links, and nearby sites of employment. Lower Tean requires some low cost affordable housing. JMW Planning's application mentions only seven, with 13 four bedroom plus houses. It should be of interest that in this area houses up to £160,000 sell quite quickly. Houses over this, including larger detached properties tend to take much longer to sell. In the last few years, several larger houses have taken up to 3 years to sell. This is an indication that JMW Planning is not applying for permission to build the houses that are needed. Therefore it is hard to see the benefit that this development will bring.

7. Thirdly, this appeal also concluded that the swift delivery of this housing was one of the benefits that should be balanced against the harm to heritage assets. Please refer to the letter from Stephen Dean MA BA ACIFA, Principal Archaeologist Staffordshire County Council dated 12/2/16. He suggests that a condition attached to any planning permission should be as follows;

‘Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, a written scheme of archaeological investigation (the scheme) shall be submitted for the written approval of the District Planning Authority. The scheme shall provide details of the programme of archaeological works to be carried out within the site, including post-excavation reporting and appropriate publication and interpretation. The scheme shall thereafter be implemented in full accordance with the approved details.’

I conclude that this requirement will not enable a swift development of the site to provide the houses that JMW Planning appears to be trying hard to convince us we need.

8. In comments made at Checkley Parish Council Meeting on 15th December 2015. Mr Jason Bloor spoke on behalf of JMW Planning. He stated that access issues will be addressed by the consultant. To date, there has been nothing submitted on behalf of this application that addresses the access, and traffic issues, that will arise if this development is given permission. In the original application, some space is given to some ‘blue sky thinking’ relating to the occupants of the new development using public transport accessed from the A522. Other than this, the applicant has failed to submit any relevant material as to how the traffic and access issues are to be addressed. Public transport is very poor. There is difficulty gaining access to local places of employment, and also it is difficult for children to access colleges and places of further education locally. The public transport in this area is very restrictive, so unless the developer intends providing the village with a much better transport service; I suggest that the 20 houses will be in possession of two cars each, just like the majority of the occupants of Lower Tean. This will mean a reality of at least 40 vehicles per day travelling along Goldhurst Drive, onto Teanhurst Road to gain access to the A522. The estate roads are not suitable for an increased level of traffic. This increase in traffic will only increase the danger to our children who use the estate roads as their playground, as they have no other open space in which to play. Play areas in Upper Tean and at the Community Hall in Checkley are both 1 mile away, and not accessible to younger children.

9. In conclusion JMW Planning has failed to submit convincing solutions to either the problem of the Historic environment, or the traffic and access issues. This application should be rejected.