

**From:** [Victoria Hughes](#)  
**To:** [Planning Comments \(SMDC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Application Reference No. : SMD/2021/0491  
**Date:** 31 May 2022 07:58:38

---

Site Address: Land Off Tenford Lane TENFORD LANE TEAN STAFFORDSHIRE ST10 4EN

I continue to object to this planning application for the following reasons

1. Significant lack of transparency around this application and all its supporting documentation from start to finish and in particular the drainage survey and reports. This provides no assurance that this was ever carried out correctly and we are still none the wiser.
2. Lack of transparency around the family relationship between one of the town councillors (Mark Deaville) and Mr Alcock (the applicant). What assurance do we have that Mr Deaville is not lobbying his fellow councillors to support this application?
3. How does this development contribute positively to the social, economical and environmental improvement of the village? Easy access to jobs and shops? What jobs? What shops? How will this development contribute to a sustainable environment? More likely there is not sufficient infrastructure to support this development when the local schools and GP Surgery are oversubscribed and there is no Dental Practice.
4. Access - what assurance do we have that the access point to the proposed development is sufficient to take service and emergency vehicles such as refuse trucks and fire engines? The lane is at its narrowest point here.
5. What net gain is there in terms of biodiversity when the field is full of wild flowers attracting bees?
6. What assurance have we had that alternative and more viable sites have been considered such as Fole Dairy where there is significant less impact and less flood risk.
7. Elevation - Why has the elevation been reduced only on house type 4? What assurance do we have that the elevation of the proposed properties situated on the significantly elevated sections of the land are in line with regulations for impact on those existing properties situated opposite where they are significantly below pavement level. This is not about personal disrupted views across open fields, this is about light deprivation from the disrupted skyline. Where are the site levels? There is no transparency around this. I request that the site officer (Chris Johnson) pays a visit to the proposed site to specifically look at this area of concern.
8. This development will not reduce the reliance on the private car for travel. There are no jobs or shops in the local village. It is not a viable and safe walking path from Tean into Cheadle. New residents will undoubtedly need a car to travel to the local supermarket and will need to commute for jobs in the local area.
9. The highway network does not satisfactorily or safely accommodate current traffic volume, let alone any new increase. What assurance do we have that an already narrow lane will accommodate a further increase in volume of traffic, when already there are points of congestion and vehicles having to mount the pavement on occasion.

I look forward to my points being addressed.  
Mrs Hughes