Burnett, James

From: Jeff Forrester
Sent: Saturday, May 07, 2016 9:59 AM
To: Planning (SMDC)
Subject: SMD/2016/0192. Redlands. St9 9lj
Attachments: IMG_0239.JPG; ATT00001.txt; IMG_0238.JPG; ATT00002.txt; IMG_0237.JPG; ATT00003.txt

With reference to the above

I have attached the previous planning application for Redlands of 2011 inspectorates reasons for rejection This was for a detached house (a separate dwelling)in the garden area of Redlands on the side of the house
Staffs moorlands rejected and the owner appealed to the inspectorate but also had this rejected

This latest planning application is very similar with the change of it being attached to the house and a single storey It is a separate dwelling with its own kitchen ,bathroom,bedroom and living space it is attached by one inner door leading to Redlands kitchen which further establishes this is a separate dwelling.

The reasons for the previous rejection are valid for this application
It would also create a possibility of later planning of a second storey or replace with the original 2011 plan

There has been several buildings established at Redlands. A metal open garage structure which on complaint from four oaks (immediate neighbor to Redlands) to your offices this structure had to be moved This houses a permanently static large speed boat and jeep. Which accompany up to 5 extra vehicles regularly and at least 3 extra daily
A raised brick platform next to my house which has been under completion for 6 years and still incomplete unused. I discussed this with your offices who classed it as brick wall structure and not subject to planning requirements albeit that it is at least 7 meters by 4 meters and 1 1/2metres high and filled in to the height creating a platform.
I was assured that this could not be used as an excuse to replace with a bigger building as the decision in 2011 was final and continuous

Although I understand you cannot acknowledge this letter I assume it suffices as a planning objection

Regards

Jeffrey Forrester. FIoD.
Longcroft
Off Stanley road
Stockton brook
Staffordshire moorlands
ST9 9LJ

Immediate next door neighbor The structure would be in the side garden next to my house

The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 March 2011

by Siân Worden BA DipLH MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 17 March 2011

Appeal Ref: APP/B3438/A/10/2143092
Redlands, Stanley Road, Stockton Brook, Stoke on Trent, Staffordshire ST9 9LJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Richard Evans against the decision of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council.
- The application Ref 10/00388/OUT, dated 23 April 2010, was refused by notice dated 6 July 2010.
- The development proposed is the construction of a detached dwelling and new vehicular access.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Procedural matter

2. The application was in outline including determination of the proposed access. All other matters were reserved.

Main Issues

3. I consider that the main issues in this case are:
   - whether the proposal would be inappropriate development for the purposes of PPG2 and development plan policy,
   - the effect of the development on the openness and visual amenity of the Green Belt, and the purposes of including land in it, and
   - if the development is inappropriate, whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development.

Reasons

Green Belt

4. The appeal site is the garden to the side of a detached house where it is proposed to build a detached dwelling. The surrounding area is mainly residential but there are open fields nearby. The proposed dwelling would not fall under one of the exceptions set out in paragraph 3.4 of PPG2 *Green Belts* and, as a new building, would therefore be defined as inappropriate development in the terms of both PPG2 and Policy N2 of the Staffordshire

Conclusion

11. I have found that the proposed development would be inappropriate development and, although there would be no conflict with the purposes of including land or detriment to visual amenity, this definitional harm to the Green Belt would be compounded by a reduction in openness. PPG2 instructs that substantial weight be attached to such harm. The other considerations put forward by the appellant in favour of the proposal do not attract sufficient weight to clearly outweigh the harm. In this case, therefore, very special circumstances to justify the development do not exist and it is contrary to both PPG2 and Local Plan Policy N2.

12. For the reasons given above, and having taken all other matters raised into consideration, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Siân Worden

Inspector

