

The Planning Inspectorate

COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

Appeal Reference: APP/B3438/W/22/3299330

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference	APP/B3438/W/22/3299330
Appeal By	ELAN HOMES (MIDLANDS) AND SCENTAREA LTD
Site Address	Land at Blythe Park Sandon Road Cresswell Staffordshire

SENDER DETAILS

Name	MRS NORMA HORNE
Address	Cherry Tree Farm Cresswell Road Cresswell STOKE-ON-TRENT ST11 9QY

ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- ☐ Appellant
- ☐ Agent
- ☒ Interested Party / Person
- ☐ Land Owner
- ☐ Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- ☐ Final Comments
- ☐ Proof of Evidence
- ☐ Statement
- ☐ Statement of Common Ground
- ☒ Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- ☐ Other

YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

Planning App was determined with quite extensive discussions with local representatives between the initial application and approval being granted.

A significant part of those discussions with local reps was in relation to concerns around road safety, both speed and volume and the end result was some specific requirements for roundabouts to be provided.

Despite a development of this size and design being against local / neighbourhood plans for a hamlet the size of Cresswell never the less planning permission was granted by SMDC planning committee.

Now after a significant time has passed the current developers want to discard the requirements that were agreed upon and change the provision.

During the years since the application was granted the issues particularly of road safety have not changed there remains significant concerns from the local residents around volume and speed of current traffic levels and further increases to that traffic being inevitable with a build of this size.

In addition reserved matters application is possibly being used to get around specific requirements of the build and to make significant amendments that were not part of the original planning permission.

For example all of a sudden the developers says that SMDC have asked them to add 3 storey construction at the gateway to the site to create a "feature". 3 storey design is not in any way in keeping with the locality

This development would increase traffic in the locality by possibly at least 250 vehicles.

There is a significant lack of local infrastructure to support this development in terms of local services (GP's, Local School Places etc) which mean that there is no service provision within walking distance of this development.

There remains significant issues with poor quality of the road leading to the proposed development.

The local highways has not maintained the road surface to an acceptable level with the usual pot holes and generally poor maintenance.

There is a significant limited pinch point just near the former pub the Izaak Walton (now a private residence) where there is only just space wide enough for 2 cars or possible 1 HGV and 1 car.

That pinch point does not give enough space should for example there be a cyclist travelling on that road to maintain the distance now required by the highway code.

Along the road there is a significant absence of footpaths meaning that even if people from the development wanted to walk somewhere that would necessitate walkers crossing over the road at several points (including some fairly difficult spots) to follow what limited footpaths there are.

The current speed that traffic travels down the road remains a concern to everyone hence the roundabout solution was to try to slow increased traffic to a possibly acceptable level.

In addition there is significant difference in the area since the original planning approval in volume from the changes on the A50 from the new JCB slip roads / junction and again increases from the development at Blythe Fields none of which appear to have been taken into account.

It is unacceptable that these items are being requested on "reserved matters" and "delegation" when they are significant changes to the original planning application that was granted.

If this build goes ahead it should go ahead on the terms that were agreed in the planning application which was granted.

Otherwise a precedent is in danger of being set where planning permission is granted with locally agreed provisions but all a developer has to do is just wait for a period of time before being able to go back to what was originally rejected or indeed to make significant changes (e.g.3 storey build).

I would therefore respectfully request that Planning Inspectorate reject this appeal in support of the SMDC planning Committee which unanimously rejected these matters in their recent consideration of the reserved matters application.