
From: Planning Comments (HPBC)
Sent: 09 September 2022 15:21
To: Planning Comments (SMDC)
Subject: FW: Objection to planning application SMD/2021/0491

Categories:

From: John Madsen
Sent: 09 September 2022 11:19
To: Planning (SMDC) Johnston, Christopher
Subject: Objection to planning application SMD/2021/0491

Objection to planning application SMD/2021/0491

This proposal is disruptive, destructive, and dangerous. If it is approved it will lead to:

- increased flooding frequency and severity;
- sewage discharge;
- increased traffic accidents, injuries and deaths; and;
- environmental destruction.

Flood Risk

This hillside site slopes steeply in two directions, down from the woodland above. The proposed development will replace a large area of permeable pasture with impermeable roads, houses, and paving. This will increase flooding of Tenford Lane, Cavendish Road and the adjoining roads, properties on the south side of Tenford Lane which are below the level of Tenford Lane, and the Tenford Lane/A522 road junction.

The proposal says that Tenford Lane does not flood at the moment. That is untrue. The authors evidently did not speak to any Tenford Lane residents. That does little for the credibility of the ensuing greenwashing and data.

The outputs from the Micro Drainage application, which are offered without any commentary, explanation, or conclusions, have a number of table entries which indicate Flood Risk, and no shortage of red data. Is 'WARNING: Half Drain Time has not been calculated as the structure is too full' a software limitation, or a warning about the capacity of the proposed system? The soakaway tests suggest that if it rains for more than 2 hours there is a problem.

Water will cascade directly down from the three rows of houses into Tenford Lane, into people's houses, and into Cavendish Road and the houses beyond that. It seems unlikely that the proposed cut-off drain would accommodate heavy rain, unless it is of gargantuan proportions. The geology of the site is light, sandy soil. There were gravel pits on the other side of the ridge. Heavy rain will wash silt into Tenford Lane, and then down to the A522 junction.

The proposal recommends swales to dump runoff into Tenford Lane, and 1483m² of infiltration basins to handle the runoff. That will convert much of the remaining pasture into a pond or a swamp. Presumably this would require safety measures to prevent vulnerable children from injury?

The narrative report quotes 917m²; the plan shows 1483m². A 60% discrepancy in the same document does not inspire confidence in the overall quality of the proposal. It does reinforce the caveats about

'waiting for detailed design' and 'these are estimates...'. And it reveals how wrong the initial data were, that the initial flood risk was hugely underestimated, and that the current proposal is mostly guesswork with no guarantees.

The proposal describes the regular and extensive maintenance required by the flood management system. Who would pay for this? I have no desire to subsidise the destruction of my environment through my taxes.

Access, traffic and transport

The site is ill-served by alternatives to motor transport. There is no convenient public transport to Stoke, or other employment and retail locations. There is one bus per hour serving Cheadle. There are no cycle routes. The site does not accord with Staffordshire Moorlands Integrated Transport Strategy.

The plans show 86 car parking spaces and 11 garages. That is about 100 additional transits on Tenford Lane during peak hours - an increase of one additional transit every 36 seconds. The development would increase motor traffic on Tenford Lane by at least 30%. Tenford Lane is narrow, wide enough for only one vehicle. It is already busy and is incapable of comfortably accommodating this increase. Drivers would use the even narrower Eastern end of Tenford Lane, and the network of single track roads beyond as a rat run. Traffic at the Tenford Lane/Breach Lane/A522 junction would increase. Tenford Lane and Breach Lane are both single carriageways.

There would be an unacceptable increase in road accidents, injuries to motorists, pedestrians, and cyclists and possibly fatalities.

Damage to the environment

The proposal would involve tearing up trees, hedges, and pasture, and destroying the natural environment. Half of the site will be The plan proposes removing an ancient oak tree for the convenience of the developers. This must not be allowed. The proposed cut-off drain would damage the ancient hedge running parallel to Tenford Lane. This is not acceptable.

Half of the pasture would be lost to bricks, concrete, paving and tarmac. A large area of the remainder would be converted to infiltration basins - either swamps or ponds, depending upon the weather. And the sewage system will be overloaded, resulting in increased dumping of sewage into the Tean.

Aesthetics

Some Tenford Lane residents will have their present skyline, consisting of hedge, pasture and woodland, replaced by three tiers of houses blotting out their light and overlooking their properties. The hillside and woodland which the development proposes to cover with roads, and buildings is visible for miles around. It is a visual asset for people well beyond those who would be directly impacted.

Management and controls

Should this development go ahead, there is a high risk that the developers will find ways to 'value engineer', or avoid essential elements of the proposal such as mitigations against flooding, and environmental damage. None of the greenwash components of the proposal carry any guarantees that they will be implemented.

If this proposal goes ahead there will be years of acrimonious wrangling about who will pay to clear up the mess left by the developers, who will pay for the flood management measures, and who will pay for the access problems. It would be financially, socially and reputationally disastrous for the community, the council, and local politicians.

This proposal must be rejected.

John Madsen

The Mount, Tenford Lane ST10 4EN

John Madsen

Do you really need to print out this Email? Be green - keep it on the screen.

This email is intended for the addressee(s) only and may contain sensitive, privileged or confidential information that could be protectively marked. If you are not the addressee please do not use the information in any way. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it from your system. Thank you.

The Council may be required to disclose this email or any responses to it under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. The way in which we handle personal information is set out in our privacy notice and is available at <https://www.highpeak.gov.uk/YourData>
