

Planning Officer
Staffordshire Moorlands District Council,
Moorlands House,
Stockwell Street,
Leek,
Staffordshire,
ST13 6HQ

Sender's address:

1 TEANHURST CLOSE
LOWER TEAN
STOKE - ON - TRENT
ST10 4NN,

I wish to object to planning application SMD/2016/0430. I challenge the Applicant's view that the proposal should benefit from the 'Presumption in favour of sustainable development' (SS1a) – and that it is consistent with the Local Plan. There are disadvantages that significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. These are outlined as follows: These are outlined as follows:

1. Highway safety and traffic generation. This development will require an additional 14 + new vehicles. These will only have access into Heath House Lane and will be forced to use housing estate roads to get to the only junction onto the A522. Since *there is zero provision in Lower Tean for children's recreational space (see 2), this extra traffic will add significantly to the danger to children who currently play on the roads, especially Goldhurst Drive and Heath House Lane.* Since it is not possible for the proposed development to have a separate access to the A522 it will inevitably channel more traffic through the estate.

For those living in Lower Tean a car is a necessity: The nearest shop and school to this proposed development are one mile away in opposite directions. There are no local employment sites. Public transport currently available is poor, and not suitable for persons attempting to access employment. Everyone who lives in the Lower Tean has to travel by car, be it for food, shopping, employment, or education.

There is already parking congestion in Heath House Lane, and the addition of extra cars, and a new junction will cause further problems for residents of Heath House Lane and Lower Tean in general. The application makes mention of one parking space per proposed property. This is clearly insufficient provision, as cars would be forced to park within the new road proposed, together with cars from the new development. The addition of extra traffic into Heath House Lane is not sustainable.

From the highway safety and traffic point of view, site LT001 is inappropriate for development.

2. Lack of public open space and play areas for children in Lower Tean (and Checkley). We have no playgrounds or open space for children to play in Lower Tean, even though it has a present population of ~680.

The nearest play areas are in Tean, one mile away, and due to the distance, and busy A522, are not suitable for children under 11-12 years to get to safely alone. Lower Tean's population is currently around 680, we have no play areas. The application mentions vaguely the possibility of the upper part of the site being left as open land. The statement is vague, and does not make any positive suggestions, as to how the lack of open space and increased danger to children from an extra junction, and increased traffic flow is to be addressed.

3. The housing type is inappropriate for local needs.

Lower Tean is a 'smaller village' as defined by the adopted core Strategy, and per the core strategy shall provide for appropriate development which meets a local social or economic need. The district needs affordable houses, and homes within the reach of first time, and second time buyers. Within the village of Lower Tean, we already have a good supply of large detached dwellings, and executive type housing. What the district is lacking are semi-detached and terraced dwellings suitable for first time buyers, and improvers. The council's own Core Strategy identifies one of its challenges as being the provision of affordable housing, and also identifies that there is an under supply of midsized units. This planning application is for outline planning permission of 7 houses to be sold at market value. There is no indication of the size or type, or style of houses that are to be built. Lower Tean requires lower cost homes, priced in the range of first time buyers and improvers in the housing market. There is insufficient information within this outline planning application as to the type of houses to be built. The council's rural area strategy states that new build housing in the countryside will be restricted to that essential to local needs. There is no indication

that this Application **will meet local housing needs, it is not meeting the council's own core strategy – it adversely affects local sustainability**. In its current form this application fails to provide sufficient detail and should be rejected.

4. Aesthetic considerations and character of the village. The planning application states that the major visual feature in this part of Lower Tean is the housing estate on the eastern side of Heath House Lane. I disagree: most of the village regard area around LT001 and the main road as being the old part of the village and to be one of its best features. There is insufficient detail to judge the character of the proposed development, this planning application, in its present form should be refused. The applicant does not provide details that could indicate that this is to be mitigated. Any development in this area requires detailed planning details of both the type, and style of the dwellings to be built. This is a valued open green field within the village, providing open views across the old part of the village, and towards the Bowl Barrow. It would intrude into a sensitive green area of land that serves to define the rural setting of the village. This area of land is also 1 metre higher than the roadway below. This would raise it above the two properties alongside, and it would over shadow the houses and the Public House opposite. Such a development would dominate this area. The development could detract from the character of the village – this is an adverse impact.

5. There are more appropriate Brownfield sites locally rather than this Greenfield site. LT001 is a Greenfield site. Brownfield sites, such as at Fole Dairy are available locally. Moreover *the Fole site can reasonably accommodate 110 houses rather than the 7 proposed here*. It is very feasible for the Local Authority to make a much greater contribution to its targets using the Fole brownfield site (low impact) than by using Greenfield site LT001 which will have high impact disadvantages to the that outweigh the benefits. The use of the Fole site is favoured by both Checkley and Lower Tean residents groups who are currently working towards the submission of a neighbourhood plan. Residents of both villages are very keen to see Fole developed as housing. Also due to the size of the development, when developed it will contribute much needed economic benefits towards the infrastructure needed to accommodate the extra residents within our Parish. **Building on Greenfield LT001 will make only a negligible contribution to the housing targets in the Local Plan, whereas use of the brownfield site at Fole will make a significant contribution with very much less negative impact.**

Use of Greenfield sites calls for sensitivity and restraint by developers, not simply building houses on the site in order to profit. This is not a sustainable option compared to local alternatives.

6. Tean and Checkley are being targeted for a disproportionate level of development that is inappropriate for the size of the community.

a) At this present time outline planning permission for 67 houses have been approved in Tean, another 49 houses in Teanford Lane have also been proposed. The Brownfield site of Fole Dairy will no doubt be developed within the 15year time period and will add at least 100 houses to the area. There will be other infill areas in the Tean, Checkley, Fole and Lower Tean. Infill areas are being identified for the local Neighbourhood plan. They will not include the site currently being proposed in this application. The total for this small part of the Moorlands is 216 houses in an area of 10 – 15 km²

b) From the Local Plan the amount of housing to be provided by all rural areas is 928 with the total area of Staffs Moorlands being 576km².

The true context of this development is that an area of less than 2% of the is being asked to absorb 23% of the Rural housing requirement of the Moorlands area. The proposed development makes this very significant imbalance in housing development distribution worse. This area is taking a 'big hit'. Considering the big picture, it is fully reasonable to reduce the unsustainably high housing density plans for this part of the SMDC area.

When set in a local context the proposed development is unsustainable and worsens an already imbalanced distribution of new developments.

7. Infrastructural challenges including transport and primary schooling. A development of 7 houses on this site will further exasperate infrastructure problems. Taken into account with 67 houses planned in Tean (approved after adopting the core strategy), there will be problems with provision of school places within the primary system. The adopted core strategy states (C1 4,) only permit new development where the utility, transport and community infrastructure necessary to serve it is either available or will be made available by the time it is needed. I believe that the occupants of 7 houses within a development which could be constructed in a short space of time could

overwhelm the educational system despite the opinion of Staffordshire Education: what individuals currently living in Lower Tean are experiencing is rather different to the rosy picture painted in the letter provided. Due to the amount of houses proposed, the developer will not be required to provide any money for our community in terms of educational support, or access to play areas, or open space for our children. This will not benefit our local community. The local school is Checkley Hutchinson Memorial. Most parents will want their children to attend their nearest local village school. This will be impossible for the occupants of our village, as the local school will not be able to accommodate extra numbers, without a substantial input of capital, which will not be forthcoming from this development. However should the Fole site be developed then money would be forthcoming, and enable educational provision to be suitably provided.

The proposal is not sustainable in terms of transport and community infrastructure.

8. Impact on the landscape context of the Designated Heritage Asset

- a) The Bowl Barrow is a Designated Heritage Asset.
- b) The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is proscriptive with regard to Designated Heritage Assets – both their material structure *and* their landscape setting and context.
- c) This Bowl Barrow is of a **very unusual type** and Historic England note that “**The location of the barrow on an artificial platform is a rare and unusual feature**”. ... **“archaeological remains will exist within the mound and upon the old landsurface”**. The Barrow is situated on a ‘local high point in the Tean Valley’
- d) The landscape context of this Barrow is clearly important to i) the demonstrably incomplete understanding of Barrow and the peoples of the region 3,500 – 4,400 years ago, including by the archaeology of its contextual area, and ii) the appreciation of the monument in its proper landscape setting on the local high point above the Tean Valley.
- e) The developer argues that the view of the monument will be enhanced. This is not the case, as it is already clearly seen from Uttoxeter Road. It will sever the Bowl barrow from the heart of the village. The photographs provided by the developer have been taken from angles which do not show this. It is also visible from the windows of our very popular Public House; with this proposed development it would not be visible. The current owners/applicants of the field have already planted a hedge which was clearly intended to obscure the view of the monument as much as possible. If the owner/applicant was at all interested in the heritage of our village, this would never have been planted. There is no serious interest in the heritage of our village; the only interest is to build on that land at any cost in order to make money.

The landscape context and situation of this Scheduled Monument would be *irreversibly damaged* by the proposed development.

9. Community involvement is significantly mis-represented in the Application (section 2.5). The Applicant notes that three residents of Lower Tean were present at a general meeting four years ago in 2011 in a different village and cites this as acquiescence.

However the Applicant chooses to be rather understated in summing up the opposition to building on this site. In response to the draft site allocation plan in the summer of 2015, there were <100 objections. In response to planning application SMD/2016 0736 earlier this year there were just under 300 objections in response to the planning application, which was correctly refused. This proposal has very significant community opposition. The letters outline the reasons.

10. The site LT001 is outside of the current Development Boundary as defined by the Local Plan that is in force now. The Council’s current active development maps show that the site is part of a “Special Landscape Area” and should not be built on.

The site is also still outside the proposed boundary currently being discussed under the forthcoming local plan. The site has already been removed from the list of potential building sites (site allocations) that are currently being discussed. The Parish Council have already begun work to develop a neighbourhood plan, and from residents in Lower Tean there is strong opposition to any building in this field, and therefore it is very unlikely that it will be considered for development.

The SMDC states. “The development boundaries and Green Belt boundaries within the 1998 Local Plan are still in force until such time as they are reviewed as part of the Site Allocations work currently being undertaken. Please refer to the Council’s Local Development Scheme for the latest timetable for the Local plan. There is widespread community opposition to any building on this site. **The proposal crosses development boundaries that are still in force, and are retained in the new local plan being considered at present.**

11. The timing of this application is designed to reduce the opportunity for community response. This application has clearly been timed to take advantage of the fact that the majority of the response period falls within the local major employers annual two week summer holiday period. Therefore any reduction in the number of objections received should be viewed, taking this cynical timing into consideration.

12. The Flooding issue in this area is consistently underestimated, and this development will increase the danger of both localised flooding, and also further flooding from the river Tean.

Recent rain storms in 2016 have caused serious flooding in Lower Tean, in Leigh Lane, and also Teanhurst Road. Nothing is mentioned in the flood report about surface water and flooding at the bottom of Heath House Lane, and Uttoxeter Road directly in front of The Dog and Partridge Public House. Despite the flood reports assumptions about the frequency of these storms. Local people are well aware of the amount, and the force of the rain water that flows down Heath House Lane, and into Uttoxeter Road, and the amount of debris that is swept down. This is a common occurrence during any period of heavy rainfall. All any drainage can do is remove water downhill, or into the river which will simply speed up, and increase the current flooding around Leigh Lane, and Mill Lane. It is worth mentioning that this year flooding follows so called improvements by experts to our drainage system in Lower Tean. It did not work, and any further building on the slopes leading down to Uttoxeter Road, i.e the proposed site for the 7 houses will only cover green fields that absorb water much better than tarmac and buildings. Development on this site will cause flooding. Within the proposed development, there is access from the new road to Uttoxeter Road. In heavy rainstorms Heath House Lane becomes a fast flowing river, this new cut through will simply channel water at speed into Uttoxeter Road, and surrounding properties.

Further comments:

In general, the above makes the detailed case against more houses placed as is proposed. However two key points that warrant reiterating are: (i) all traffic from the proposed new houses would have only one direct exit onto the A522, creating dangerous conditions; (ii) the titulus is part of our heritage — once destroyed, diminished or compromised part of our heritage has similarly lost out and cannot be restored.

I ask that you reject this outline planning permission in its current form.

Yours sincerely,