

24 Cavendish Road
Clarendon Park
Upper Tean
Staffs
ST10 4RH

Rachael Simpkin (Handling Officer)
Planning Department
Staffordshire Moorlands District Council
Moorlands House
Stockwell Street
Leek, ST13 6HQ

31st January 2017

Dear Ms Simpkin,

OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION SMD/2016/0811
LAND OFF TENFORD LANE, TENFORD LANE, TEAN

I would like to express my strong objection and concerns relating to the planning application (reference above) in respect of a proposed housing development adjacent to Tenford Lane, Tean. I have already expressed my concerns relating to this plot of land as part of the consultation in respect of the Local Plan and also as part of the original application SMD/2016/0200. My previous correspondence is attached to this letter as an Appendix and I duly wish all the points within to remain noted.

Protection of Land

I would stress that the land in question is currently classed as 'constrained' on the Local Plan and as such should surely be considered protected and carry considerable weight in the outcome. This opportunistic application, in the interim period of finalising the Local Plan, should be recognised as such, a blatant show of 'playing the system'. The long-term affect on the village should be seriously considered and not be at risk due to a land owner trying to benefit at the expense of irreversible devastation to the landscape. Other land in the vicinity has been granted planning permission; 67 houses by the Anchor Pub and a further 6 at land off Gorsty Hill Road. Upper Tean only requires 100 houses per the local plan and these recently granted applications are getting close to 100. Therefore, these 49 houses are not required and would exceed the quota.

Adverse Noise Affect

Further to the original application being refused, at the planning hearing on 3rd November 2016, I note that the applicant has resubmitted an application trying to address the matter of adverse noise from the adjacent Tenford Kennels. Moving the site 90m further from the kennels is not going to resolve the noise disturbance which can be for prolonged periods of time throughout each day. Having looked at the noise report it isn't a true reflection of the noise activity relating to the kennels. The recordings were taken at a time when the kennels was at one of its quietest periods and in addition to this they were also taken mid afternoon and in the middle of the night! The dogs' feeding and walking times can create a significant sound which can be heard quite loudly at my home on Clarendon Park (approximately .25 mile away). To have this as a final record of the noise levels from the kennels is not correct and unacceptable. The district strongly relies on this boarding and rescue service and to threaten its future would be devastating. SMDC surely have a public duty to consider the impact on such a reliable, longstanding, established resource, with possible complaints from potential adjacent residents. To lose this facility would be a far reaching travesty.

continued...

At the hearing in November 2016, the architect from Hewitt and Carr stated that the site houses have been designed with substantial insulation and ventilation and that the home owners wouldn't be required to open their windows and therefore wouldn't hear the noise produced from the kennels. To say that she was nearly laughed out of the room would be an understatement. How many homebuyers would accept the advice of keeping their window and doors tightly closed, not to mention the fact that using their gardens would be out of the question without ear protection!

At the hearing a member of SMDC staff quoted a precedent case regarding a publican who was successful in winning his case in the High Court regarding a potential adjacent development threatening the closure of his business as a consequence of development. The same potential risk is palpable regarding the threat to Tenford Kennels which is a vital resource providing an invaluable service to the locality.

Increased Flood Risk

It is difficult to see how this site could itself be subject to flooding. However, the surface water runoff from the development will impact on locations downstream of the River Tean. Approval has already been granted for 67 dwellings a short distance from this proposed site, off Cheadle Road. Storm water from this, plus the proposed development will inevitably enter the River Tean at a faster rate than it does at present. This will increase the number and severity of flooding events that already occur along the river at Upper Tean, Lower Tean, Checkley and Fole. In storm conditions the combined flow from these sites will increase the chances of flooding to an unacceptable level along with all the misery, upheaval and costs it inflicts on established local families. The proposal is for soakaways for each property which would rapidly send excess water into the water course which in turn adds to the flooding risk. These would need to be well maintained as it is highly probable that they will eventually silt up.

The owner of Tenford Kennels has confirmed that in times of heavy rain, her land drain will not cope with the water flow from the field and although an extra soak away has been installed at the kennels, they still frequently experience high water levels, which can take up to 2 weeks to drain away. Some time ago, she submitted a planning application for new kennels and applied to Severn Trent Water for permission to connect to the water mains, for water waste only. Planning permission was refused due to Severn Trent stating that the current drainage system would not be able to take the additional volume of water, hence the soak away was installed, which does not adequately cope. She is not aware of any additional drainage works having taken place in Tenford Lane since then.

Foul Water Sewerage system

The main foul sewer running through the Tean Valley that joins the main sewer from Blythe Bridge, frequently floods during storm conditions and surcharges, depositing raw sewerage into the valley. Despite remedial measures by the Drainage Authority, spillages still occur regularly.

Pedestrian safety

We also do not consider that this development is sustainable in terms of traffic, transport and safety. Access to public transport in this area is poor and expensive. There is a lack of footway between the proposed development and Cheadle Road with no opportunity to create one. The Residents would always have to cross the road to get to the footpath. The road system around Tenford Lane, Gorsty Hill and access into the village is unsatisfactory. I feel this issue needs thorough and urgent investigation by the Highways Division as it is now an ongoing hazard that can only be exacerbated with an increased volume of traffic (49 x 2 cars per household, in addition to the expected volume of traffic created by the Gorsty Hill development).

continued...

The quickest route to walk from the proposed site to Upper Tean, to access the amenities, would mean tackling the journey without any footpaths with the national speed limit of 60mph on the country lanes. When using Tenford Lane, I regularly witness vehicles mounting the curb to allow two vehicles to pass each other safely. In addition, whilst walking my children to school via Gorsty Hill Road, we often have to swiftly clamber up the verge to avoid speeding vehicles.

The concerns of residents and those who live adjacent to this proposed site should be listened to more than anybody as they will be the most affected. This is a beautiful piece of land which is enjoyed by all. The threat of it being churned up and developed upon is a devastating prospect to all the existing residents who benefit from the rural aspect surrounding their homes.

In conclusion I strongly object to this application because of the aforementioned reasons and look forward to you refusing planning permission for this proposed development. I await your response and acknowledgement of the receipt of this letter.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs H Hunt.

24 Cavendish Road
Clarendon Park
Upper Tean
Staffs
ST10 4RH

Rachael Simpkin (Handling Officer)
Planning Department
Staffordshire Moorlands District Council
Moorlands House
Stockwell Street
Leek, ST13 6HQ

20 April 2016

Dear Ms Simpkin,

OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION SMD/2016/0200 LAND OFF TENFORD LANE, TENFORD LANE, TEAN

I would like to express my strong objection and concerns relating to the planning application (reference above) in respect of a proposed housing development adjacent to Tenford Lane, Tean. I have already expressed my concerns relating to this plot of land as part of the consultation in respect of the Local Plan.

Whilst I do acknowledge that there is a lack of housing nationally developers should not be allowed to massacre the countryside when there are many more suitable Brownfield sites and properties for sale and available in the locality. In addition to the inability of the Council to provide an approved Local Plan, this is not an excuse for the Council to consider and approve housing applications without full consultation. The process needs to be co-ordinated, fit in with the local plan (which is still subject to significant challenge following the meeting of the Council Assembly on 13th April) and fully consider the views and concerns of local residents.

Concerns and Questions

1. **Housing numbers and location** – There are already many proposed housing developments between, Cheadle, Mobberley and Upper Tean which are currently in progress or have been identified for development. To approve yet another development within this relatively small area would be overkill and out of balance with development within the Staffordshire Moorlands District. It would seem to be common sense to further pursue those sites in the local plan designated green or amber status for development. The site of concern here UT041 is a 'red – constrained'.
2. **Vacant properties** - The development of Tean Hall Mill has increased housing stock in Upper Tean significantly already and there are still many properties unoccupied within that development. I suggest prior to the Council passing any more applications that the empty properties in the Mill are reviewed with a view to filling those properties as a priority. The Council approved that development and therefore needs to ensure it secures its income from them in the form of council tax before it approves any more development. Are these properties vacant as they are not the correct type of housing for Upper Tean? In which case why did the Council approve that application for development? The Council needs to ensure that the location and type of future developments is what is specifically required for Upper Tean.

3. **Land status** – The land proposed provides a beautiful backdrop for the residents of Clarendon Park and Tenford Lane. These Residents have paid a premium for these open views which are now under threat from this development.
4. **Access** – I note that the application is silent on what access improvements are to be made to the narrow Tenford Lane. To expect that residents in the vicinity of Tenford Lane within metres of the UT041, UT018 and UT012 proposals to bear the brunt of the entire development is unreasonable. Each of these developments will access the same busy junction with Cheadle Road, Breach Lane and Tenford Lane which is already a very dangerous junction with poor visibility. Within metres of this junction is also where our children catch the schools bus. It is unacceptable that this application is put forward with no solution to these serious issues. Frequently cars need to mount the curb here to pass each other on Tenford Lane which is a very narrow road with poor visibility. If this development proceeds it could potentially lead to an extra (as quoted in the planning application)112 cars utilising such an inadequate thoroughfare.
5. **Aesthetic appearance** – on the 3rd December 2015 myself and a significant number of residents attended the meeting the developer had arranged with the architects for the development. I must say that Hewitt and Carr were lost for words and could not give answers to residents questions and were actually speechless. They could provide little of a positive nature to say about the development and none of our concerns were answered. I hope you received the feedback from the meeting to take into consideration for this planning application as I know a significant number of us left comments on forms at the meeting and subsequently e-mailed Hewitt and Carr. I can't see that any of this feedback is included within the planning application? In addition, from the obvious aesthetic destruction of such green and pleasant land which provides an abundance of natural habitats and the subsequent loss of value of established properties there are other fundamental reasons why this development should not be approved. The massive increase in traffic as already mentioned and the upheaval in providing amenities to this substantial development will be unsustainable on such a tight single track road. This thoroughfare is the main right of way to Winnothdale and those navigating Gorsty Hill. This will need massive infrastructure change and destroy the natural topography of the land. The significant natural gradient of the land and its sand based composition at UT041(adjacent to a former sand and gravel quarry) is going to cause a real danger of flooding (despite what your survey says). This will obviously affect the road but also the established housing which is at the very foot of the slope. It is fact that following heavy rain the run off from the land makes Tenford Lane akin to a river and an ice hazard in cold weather. Concerns are also of note as regards the overall height of the proposed development, in relation to existing housing which is below street level. This would subject residents to be overlooked and reduce the natural light in their properties.
6. **Amenities** - This proposed development will also increase the strain on the local provision for education, health and other amenities. The village is already under strain with schools oversubscribed, an inability to seek medical advice and an inability to access basic needs in the high street due to parking restrictions.

In conclusion I strongly object to this application because of the aforementioned reasons and look forward to you refusing planning permission for this proposed development. I await your response to the questions posed and to acknowledge the receipt of this letter.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs H Hunt.