

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/23/3330535

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference APP/B3438/W/23/3330535

Appeal By MR & MRS R COLLIER

Site Address
Woodland View
Tenford Lane
Teaen
Staffordshire
ST10 4EL
Grid Ref Easting: 402135
Grid Ref Northing: 340090

SENDER DETAILS

Name MR DAVID WHITE

Address
Little Gorsty Hill Gorsty Hill
Teaen
STOKE-ON-TRENT
ST10 4EL

Company/Group/Organisation Name Owners of Little Gorsty Hill, Gorsty Hill

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

We feel that the decision made on 14.7.23 by the planning department (Refusal of Reserved Matters) was correct, in that the site would have been overdeveloped and at odds with the neighbouring properties. Vehicular access and parking would also be an issue if the plan had been approved because: there are insufficient parking spaces and our lane is not wide enough to provide the extra parking that would be needed by visitors to the proposed houses; there are no passing places on the lane and the narrowness of the lane already causes concern for pedestrians using it; the access required by the fire brigade is insufficient, according to their requirements; and the council refuse collection has already been compromised due to insufficient turning space at the top of the lane (where the proposed development is) and this development would compound that problem.

Regarding adequate drainage, two houses on the lane have already been flooded due to surface water flooding (one being ours, and the other being next to the proposed development) and in both cases the water entered the houses. The house neighbouring the proposed development suffered structural damage as a result of landslip during the flooding. Development of the site will further impede the storm water being able to drain away due to the increased hard surfaces on the site which could, in all probability, cause flooding to another neighbouring property which is situated at a lower elevation to the proposed development.

As has previously been documented by residents, we feel that there were irregularities when the access to the site was initially approved. In light of the evidence of these irregularities which has been brought to light by residents through their own research and through the Freedom of Information Act, we wonder why the council are unwilling or unable to reconsider the initial access approval and why they are allowing this farcical application to continue.