

From: [Steve Cantrell](#)
To: [Planning \(SMDC\)](#)
Subject: Planning Application SMD/2021/0491
Date: 03 September 2021 20:08:58

FAO: Chris Johnston
SMCC Planning Department

Chris,

I would like to formally object to the recent planning application, SMD/2021/0491, submitted for land off Tenford Lane, Tean.

I have reviewed the application and would like to bring to your attention the following points (in no particular order);

1. The original application (SMD/2016/0811) denoted that part of the hedgerow between the former Kennels should be replaced by Acoustic Fencing. As the Kennels is no longer operational there is now no requirement to remove the hedgerow and damage habitat. This should be stipulated in any decision.
2. I couldn't find any mention of Street Lighting in the application. As the land is elevated above Tenford Lane the proposed site will light up the adjacent area and pollute the night sky. The immediate area is frequented by Bats. What can be done to mitigate this issue?
3. On the drawing 00438 AL(0)17 Proposed Site Plan Plot's 34,35,36 are too close to the southern boundary and will be overlooking the houses directly opposite in Tenford Lane. These three plots should be moved forward to be in line with the rest of the proposed plots.
4. The Application form does not indicate who the related Authority member is. The applicant has ticked Yes, but not disclosed who. The application form clearly states...

"It is an important principle of decision-making that the process is open and transparent

For the purposes of this question, "related to" means related, by birth or otherwise, closely enough that a fair-minded and informed observer, having considered the facts, would conclude there was bias on the part of the decision maker in the Local Planning Authority"

As the information is not present how can the application be decided transparently and fairly.

Can you please confirm in writing if this omission invalidates the application form as it is incomplete?

I am seeking independent legal advice on this matter.

5. The application wants to cut down tree T4541. This tree must be over 100 years old at least. There is enough habitat destruction going on and trees should be protected not cut down.
6. There are no pavements on the both sides of the proposed new roads. The applicant states that people can walk into Tean village to use the local services. If this is the case then pedestrian safety should be a priority.
7. There are no descriptions on the application as to what the houses will be built out of? i.e. type of brick, or roof type. What stipulations will be made to ensure the houses are built

so they are in keeping with the local area.

8. The ghost road opposite Plot 40 that runs north up the field is not required. It serves no purpose except increasing the amount of habitat destruction and potential water run off. Other laybys in the local area are frequently used by people in cars to dump fast food wrappers and other rubbish. This will become another spot to do just that. This should be removed from the plan layout.
9. The footpath through the landscaped section is proposed to be tarmac. It should be gravel at the most to reduce run off and habitat destruction. Ideally it should be left to grass so a natural path can be forged through the field.
10. If the site is built upon, the resulting houses will mean an absolute loss of visual amenity for the community. From Wentlows fields, the Teanford settlement is surrounded by fields and trees and the view from the top of Wentlows fields (Southerly adjacent to Tenford Lane) across to the proposed site is beautiful. Building houses on this site will destroy the view and visual amenity for the local community. I have included a photograph to demonstrate.
11. The northern boundary of the field grants direct access to a disused quarry that includes ponds and quick sand. The current fence is waist high at best. This presents a clear danger to any future residents (especially children) who gain access to the quarry. A taller, secure fence should be stipulated to keep people out of the Quarry and prevent any accidents from happening.
12. What protection will the Hedgerows on the southern boundary be afforded. What is to stop any future owners of the houses that back on to the hedgerow from removing them?
13. The Foul and Surface Drainage strategy document includes the Severn Trent Sewer Record drawing that shows where the current drains are. However, this diagram does not show any drains for houses 30-58 Tenford Lane drains. Can you be confident the proposed additional houses will not overload the current downstream capacity without knowing all current drainage routes?
14. The Foul and Surface Drainage strategy document also reports there is no record of where the Soakaway Test trial pits were dug, nor how many times the test was performed. How can this report be used to validate the drainage of the site, especially the proposed location of the Drainage Infiltration Basin's?
15. The 3no proposed Drainage Infiltration Basin's adjacent to the hedge row are the main point of surface water collection. The soil in Tenford Lane is made up of sand and gravel (hence the Quarry to the north) so any build-up of water may have consequences to the integrity of the surrounding area, including the roads, services and houses directly opposite.

I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,
Steve Cantrell

