

SMD/2021/0266

14 MAY 2021

Site address

Flying Horse Inn, 130 Ashbourne Road, Leek, Staffordshire, ST13 5BJ

I strenuously object and ask the planning committee to refuse this application.

Firstly on the grounds the property is a community asset and secondly on the ground it is more suitable for affordable or community housing. Thirdly, it will deprive the population of a community asset.

Firstly:

Whoever is able to restore this community asset will be giving good service to the town but it will be lost forever if five houses are allowed on the site for profit only. In addition, the applicant's actions and intentions are clear in the light of closure and clearance of the premises.

It have over thirty years licensed trade experience in the Staffordshire Moorlands and have lived in the vicinity of The Flying Horse for over 20 years. I was interested in the property because it was a thriving business when I first used it as a customer in 1999. Sadly, trade reduced over the years because of the way the business was operated and the lack of investment with the result increasing house prices mean the land is now worth more for residential development.

I refer to the planning statement prepared by Rob Duncan part of which is printed below:

"5 It is also highlighted that the Flying Horse Inn has been actively marketed as a going concern on behalf of the previous owners, Admiral Taverns. Correspondence from the marketing agent involved in disposing of the premises is enclosed as Appendix A and confirms that the property had an initial asking price of £325,000 which was subsequently reduced twice down to £275,000. The report from the marketing agent confirms that a total of 7,356 sets of details were sent to interested parties, and that the site was continuously marketed between January 2020 and December 2020 via a number of websites. A copy of the Sales Particulars is enclosed as Appendix B.

5.6 Most pertinently, it is confirmed that there were only two offers made, and in both cases the interest was in acquiring the site for re-development and not for reuse as a public house or other community facility. The marketing exercise carried out lends further support to the submitted proposal and leads me to conclude that the proposed development does not derive any conflict with policy C1 of the Local Plan".

Mr Duncan is mistaken and has obviously not been given correct information. I enquired about purchasing the property and was told the vendor was looking for offers in excess of . I can confirm an offer was made in June 2020 in the sum of . The amount on offer reflected the investment necessary to restore the fabric of this community asset to it's former prosperity and thereby create sustainable jobs. I was not given opportunity to make my case to the vendor.

Secondly:

A second objection concerns the type of housing and layout of the proposed development. If the committee determines the site must be residential housing then affordable or community places are in shorter supply and more beneficial to the town and certainly preferable to five houses now envisaged.

Thirdly, This community asset is within walking distance of a lot of people with parking for disabled.

Yours sincerely, Andrew Easom. 12th May 2021

25 MILLTOWN,
WAY
ST13 5SZ

Andrew Easom