

26 October 2023

Dear Sir/Madam

Re Planning Application SMD/2023/0423, plus relevant planning applications SMD/2021/0491 and SMD/2023/0240

I would like to object to the following planning application on the following grounds:

Highway Safety:

Significant concern was expressed by the majority of existing residents on the suitability of Tenford Lane to take the extra traffic from the proposed 40 houses. Tenford Lane narrows to single file traffic both at the top and the bottom of the lane. The junction of Tenford Lane/Cheadle Road/Breach Lane is already problematic, with accidents occurring on both Tenford/Breach Lane (See Appendix 1 Collision data - Staffordshire Safer Roads Partnership).

Where Tenford Lane narrows, cars mount the kerb daily in order to pass. We still don't know the impact the existing planning permission for 40 houses will have on this junction, let alone another 47 more. The impact of rush hour traffic on the Tenford Road/Cheadle Road junction will, in all probability, result in cars from both Clarendon Park and the new estate opting to go up Tenford Lane and then down Gorsty Hill. Gorsty Hill is totally unsuitable for heavy traffic. A rural single country lane with a sharp bend, poor visibility splays, a hidden junction, no pavements and no street lighting. The majority of those walking to the two local primary schools take the Gorsty Hill route. The extra danger on the roads will make it extremely hazardous – and yet as part of reducing our carbon footprint, we are supposed to be encouraging walking and making walking routes more attractive. Absolutely zero improvements to encourage our children/parents to walk to school. The schools are having real problems with parking (check out recent Facebook comments on Checkley Parish Council website) – and you want to add more to this mix?

Paragraph 97 of the NPPF, Paragraph 110 and 112 details how the safety of pedestrians and those with disabilities should be considered as a priority. Unless something is done about the existing road infrastructure surrounding both Clarendon Park and the proposed development, this is an accident waiting to happen and SMDC planning/SCC highways will be failing to safeguard the local community, if this is passed with no recommendations to mitigate the extra risk.

The original transport report dated 2015 (uploaded to the portal in February 2023) did not give actual TRICS data. The data, based on 49 houses during peak hour, was 29 journeys AM and 28 journeys PM. The new transport plan indicates that as a result of the additional houses there will be an extra 28 AM and 26 PM. So in total for 87 family homes (generally most households have 2 cars now), we are expected to believe that during the rush hour there will be just 57 extra car journeys AM and 54 PM. Considering that some of the larger 4 bedded homes will likely have teenagers driving etc (use Clarendon Park as an example), I really think this will be considerably more. The schools are not within 10 minutes walking distance, meaning residents will rely on their cars. Why

have there been no surveys on actual TRICS data? Even if we were to believe it will be 57 and 54 cars that, in itself, is a massive increase to the current **UNSUITABLE** lane!

I'd like to ask for clarification of the following:

The decision notice for planning application SMD/2016/0811 dated 02-08-2018 stated clearly:

5. No more than 40 dwellings shall be built on the site.

Reason:- For clarity and the avoidance of doubt.

Could someone from SMDC planning please clarify how this new planning permission can be granted, given the condition of the previous planning decision? As work has already commenced on the site and building commenced, how can it now be amended to incorporate 87? Should it not be that a further planning application should be made for an additional 47 houses?

I can see on the application form that it stated pre-application advice had been sought. For some reason, the details of the officer giving that advice/information has been rescinded - there is no reason for this information to be rescinded because the person giving the advice would be a public officer and, therefore, not a 3rd party. The details of the pre-application advice received was "discussion regarding implications of [Hillside Judgment](#)". This seems to lead to the "Pilkington Principle" and the determination is now whether the new application can be physically possible, given the building work has already started. Given the layout of the site is totally different in the new application and two houses/units appear to have been commenced, I can't see how this is physically possible. If it is physically possible, for absolute clarity, can the council/developers indicate which houses have already commenced construction in accordance with the existing plan and how these match the new plan? Can the council please give assurance on the legality of this issue? Checkley Parish Council has asked the same question. I don't see how this application can move forward until this point is clarified.

It seems to me there was always going to be "green space" left over which would have at least been some consolation but it is clear the developers want to "do away" with any greenspace, as the council had made it perfectly clear they would not adopt it and it would need a management company to look after this.

I also note there is a further application on the portal - **SMD/2023/0240** which details many changes to the site, the road layout, road levels (and possible heights to the houses?), adding in private roads, amendments to roof pitches, changing 3 beds to 4 beds, adding in two new house types, adding in raised decking to the bungalows and the orientation of the houses all appear to have changed. Again looking at the old plans and comparing these to the new ones, it is difficult to see how these will match when building has already commenced. Which planning permission are the developers currently building off? If layout, appearance and scale was part of the reserved matters approved for SMD/2021/0491, how can this now be changed without a new planning application? Can you confirm that, if this were to be approved, is this physically possible, given the building has already commenced?

The planning permission for these houses was already questionable:

- Building on greenbelt land, going against NPPF guidance
- Building across the Parish Boundary, going against the local plan and NPPF guidance
- Unsafe - No planned improvement to the existing roads to mitigate any safety concerns

- Unsustainable – one bus stop across the road to a bus service that only runs once an hour is hardly sustainable. There isn't even a bus shelter!
- Not within a reasonable 10 minute walking distance
- Schools over subscribed
- GP Surgery over subscribed
- Walk to secondary schools dangerous, narrow pavements, usually overgrown with weeds and hedges.
- No safe cycle routes or cycle paths to encourage children to cycle to school
- Not one plan for sustainable energy sources – air source heat pumps & solar power, etc
- We don't know whether the proposed SUDS/drainage scheme will be adequate for the existing plans, let alone more houses. All the desktop studies in the world won't account for the real life experience. We are experiencing more extreme weather which we are not ready for.
- The theme throughout the NPPF is to build safe, sustainable and cohesive communities - this application does not tick any of those boxes.
- We have a local plan – the levelling up bill currently going through parliament states that the need for a five year housing plan is not required if there is a local adopted plan.
- We have a neighbourhood plan that has gone through regulation 16 – this plan needs to be given material consideration. This plan intends to protect our villages – see also appendix 2 re Communities taking back control – that's **OUR** community, not yours SMDC!
- In upper Tean we already experience heavy traffic issues with Sat Navs bringing Alton Towers traffic through Tean, JCB and Croxden Quarry HGV traffic, not to mention when the A50 shuts
- The construction company have, so far, showed little consideration for the conditions placed on them for the amenity of residents with workers regularly attending the site and commencing work from 7:30am and delivery vehicles queuing on the lane before 8am - we have photographic evidence
- Car parking provision for 2 cars won't be enough for the bigger 4 bedded homes – see Clarendon Park/Riverside Road any evening of the week for evidence! No provision for visitors or deliveries. There will be cars all over the roads, once again, making the site unsafe and unsightly

This exert is taken from Sir Bill Cash's letter when he wrote, backing his constituents:

The SMDC's Core Strategy and emerging Local Plan indicate a housing need of 100 dwellings in Upper Tean for the period up to 2031. This proposed development on Tenford Lane plus the approved development on Cheadle Road will take the number of dwellings to 116. There are other sites in Upper Tean that, if the Local Plan is adopted will serve to further increase this number. Therefore, assuming that the 100 dwellings was considered to be a sustainable level of development, any additional dwellings imposed will be unsustainable with local services, including GP practises and schools coming under unsustainable pressure.

Currently in the areas Upper Tean/Lower Tean, Fole and Mobberley we have over 230 houses approved and this is discounting this application for another 47 and the 30 behind Riverside Road. Checkley Parish Council has more than enough of its quota now – why not move on to some other areas that have better links and infrastructure, instead of continually ruining or villages? Or is it because houses here will attract a premium price so greed is the driving force, rather than need?

If we must build, get the infrastructure developed first and put everyone's safety top of the agenda.

I have copied my letter to our three Checkley councillors to ask if they can act on behalf of the many residents who are concerned about this. Cllr Wilkinson, I appreciate as being Chair of the Planning Committee, may be unable to get involved to ensure no pre-determination or conflict of interest so this letter, therefore, heavily relies on Cllr Deaville and Cllr Hulme.

Many thanks

Tracy Smith

Cc Cllr Peter Wilkinson
 Cllr Mark Deaville
 Cllr Alan Hulme

Appendix 1:

Collision data published 28/03/2022

Displaying Fatal, Serious, Slight collisions between 01/01/2018 and 31/12/2020

Affecting Tean/Cheadle area – taken from Staffordshire Safer Roads Partnership

<https://www.ssrptraffweb.co.uk/rtcplus/index.html>

A522 Cheadle/Tean:

8 Slight

5 serious – two of which are very close to the proposed site

Tenford Lane

1 slight

0 serious

Breach Lane:

2 slight

0 serious (doesn't count near misses which happen every day on Breach Lane!)

Hollington Road

2 slight

1 serious

Appendix 2:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/long-term-plan-for-housing>:

Communities taking back control / building beautiful everywhere

To deliver housing anywhere, all new homes built will need to be accepted by the community – they will need to be beautiful, well-connected, designed with local people in mind and be accompanied by the right community infrastructure and green space. Communities must have a say in how and where homes are built.

In this plan, communities will be supported to be at the heart of new development in their areas. This will be achieved by:

- Establishing the Office for Place in Stoke-on-Trent, a new body to lead a design revolution, ensuring beautiful new homes are built according to a simple design code supported by local people. The Office for Place will support residents to demand what they find beautiful from developers – ensuring every local place is built to reflect the individual local character and beauty of every community across the country. Nicholas Boys Smith has been appointed as the interim chair.
- Supporting councils to deliver high quality up to date local plans, launching a consultation to seek views on our proposals to simplify the system of developing a new plan. Local plans are the best way to ensure the right homes are built in the right places, so the government will work with councils to reduce the cost and bureaucracy associated with getting an updated plan in place. The government is also clear that local authorities should continue to develop their local plans, ensuring **local people get their say**.

Appendix 3 – Site Plan SMD/2021/0491 relating to outline PP SMD/2016/0811



Site plan for the proposed development at 01204 PJ021. The plan shows a large green area with a winding road and several clusters of buildings. A red line outlines the development boundary. Surrounding areas include 'Cricket Ground' to the south and 'Houses' to the west. A north arrow is located in the bottom right corner.