
From: Planning <Planning@sammonsLtd.co.uk>
Sent: 10 June 2024 23:20
To: North2
Subject: RE: Planning Inspectorate APP/B3438/W/24/3338540: 403 Cheadle Road, ST13 7BH

Good evening Michael further to your email below I would be pleased if you could accept the following comments as the appellant's response to the council's Statement of Case for the above. The paragraphs referenced below relate to those set out in the council's Statement of Case:

Paragraph 1.3 – The fact that the council has subsequently permitted a scheme for residential development on the site does not mean that they should not have accepted the appeal submission. As set out in detail in the appellant's statement of case the density of the appeal scheme was in keeping with the surrounding development with plot sizes, orientation and layout identical to that approved on the adjacent site (The Oaks). Whilst the amenity space afforded to the host building under the approved scheme would be marginally greater than the appeal scheme the resultant garden area would not be insignificant, met all adopted standards and would have still resulted in the provision of a much greater amenity space than any of the neighbouring plots due to the existing generous plot. It is important to note that the majority of the developable site area comprises of an adjacent paddock rather than the amenity area of the host dwelling.

Paragraph 5.1 raises the same issues as those stated above.

Paragraph 5.2 highlights the policy requirements to provide the bulk of housing requirements for the rural areas in larger areas such as this.

Paragraph 5.3 also sets out the requirement of Policy H1 for housing development to be "at the most appropriate density compatible with the site and its location, and with the character of the surrounding area, and in all case the development shall not lead to a prominent intrusion into the countryside." The refusal of the appeal scheme and the council's acceptance of a smaller less intensive form of development means that the council has failed to meet this objective. As set out in detail in the submitted statement of case the council have historically had a chronic under supply of housing which has been sustained and prolonged. Approval of a smaller scheme for 3 dwellings means that the council have not only have wasted the opportunity to maximise and realise the full potential of the site but have accepted an inferior scheme which fails to deliver an appropriate number of units at a time when there is a chronic shortfall of housing within the district.

Contrary to the statement in paragraph 5.4 the appeal scheme would deliver a scheme whose density was appropriate to the site and wider surrounding area and which respects and reflects that of adjacent surrounding development. The council describe the appeal scheme as "too dense on a cramped layout that would be urban in character and not reflective of its rural location". The differences between the appeal scheme and the approved scheme are relatively little and it is difficult to believe that the removal of a single dwelling adequately addressed the above issues. No significant changes to layout were made with both the approved scheme and the appeal scheme comprising of a short backland cul de sac arrangement with dwellings set on one side of it. Such changes had little impact on the "urban" character of the site and how the council can claim that it is not reflective of its rural location when it is identical to a scheme next door is somewhat difficult to understand. It is therefore not accepted that the scheme would "not relate well to the pattern, scale, character and form of the surrounding development and be out of keeping with an detract from the spacious character and appearance of the area" as the surrounding development is exactly what has been used to inform the appeal scheme.

The appeal dwellings are not large as set out in paragraph 5.5 of the council's appeal statement and comprise of standard sized four bedroom properties. The size of the appeal dwellings was not amended as part of the scheme subsequently approved by the council. The appeal dwellings are not "squeezed" onto a "fairly tight site" but have been well designed and considered and meet ALL of the council's adopted standards as set out in the Space About Dwellings SPG as well as meeting the requirements of the NDSS.

5.7 The council's claim that Cheadle Road is busy to cross has not been mentioned previously. It is not understood why crossing of Cheadle Road is required at this point given that there are only open agricultural fields on the opposite side of the highway. It is not considered that the reduction in the number of dwellings from 4 to 3 would really have any impact on this in any event or that the road would be any safer to cross.

5.8 The councils comment "limited provision to park and turn a vehicle" is wholly unsubstantiated. As set out in the appellant's statement of case the Highways Authority raised no objections on highway safety grounds. No technical or expert advice has been provided by the council to back up this claim or indeed challenge the view of the Highway Authority. The paragraph goes to confirm that the appeal scheme meets the councils local plan parking guidance by providing three parking spaces but then discounts the proposed garages on the basis that these "are generally used for household storage". This is pure conjecture and the use of such could and should have been secured via an appropriately worded condition. It is noted that the council took the opportunity to do this on the granting of the smaller scheme for 3 dwellings despite specifically rejecting this as an appropriate way forward during the debate of the appeal scheme. If the council are not going to accept garages as providing parking then this should be specifically set out in the adopted SPG. Similarly the reliance of tandem parking is raised in the council's statement of case but is not rejected or prevented in the adopted car parking standards or the council's adopted planning policies. The plots are sizeable plots and should residents have "significant storage needs" then this could have been met through the erection of further outbuildings within the curtilage. For the reasons set out in the appellants statement of case it is not considered that the layout would provide tortuous parking arrangements or that vehicle movements would conflict between neighbours and their visitors.

5.10 The appeal scheme clearly meets all of the council's adopted standards in relation to amenity and interface distances. The appeal scheme would not deliver poor living conditions or substandard amenity for future residents or users of the development and this was confirmed by the case officer in the committee report which recommended refusal of the scheme. Any suggestion of such now is nothing more than a blatant attempt by the council to try and construct an argument once Members had made the decision to refuse the scheme.

5.12 The council's claim that the development would be harmful to the amenity afforded to the host dwelling is flawed citing the fact that it would reduce its garden area and be bound on three boundary sides by roadway and vehicle movements. The approved scheme is no different to the appeal scheme in this regard and would still result in the reduction in the garden area and provide vehicle movements on three sides. There is no direct link between the reduction in number of units and number of vehicle movements as this is dictated by the end occupier. It is entirely possible for the number of vehicle movements for a 3 unit housing development to have equally as many if not more vehicle movements that a 4 bed development. i.e. if dwellings were occupied by older people whose children had left home or professional couples rather than as family homes.

5.13 None of the dwellings to the south of the development site would suffer an unreasonable loss of amenity due to the separation distances between. The fact that the council have accepted a slightly smaller scheme with virtually identical layout would attest to this fact.

It is the appellants clear view that the appeal scheme, which met all adopted planning policies and guidance should have been approved and whilst the approval of a subsequent albeit smaller scheme has provided a useful fall back position the appeal scheme is actually preferable in terms of density, layout, size, scale, form and design to that which has been approved. The Inspector is respectfully requested to consider the above points as part of the appeal process.

Kind Regards

Teresa Critchlow BA(Hons), MPlan

For and behalf of



t: 01538 386002 I w: www.sammonsLtd.co.uk

10 Cawdry Buildings, Fountain Street, Leek, Staffordshire, ST13 6JP

SAMMONS ARCHITECTURAL Ltd. PRIVACY AND CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

This e-mail is confidential to the intended recipient at the e-mail address to which it has been addressed. It may not be disclosed to, or used by anyone other than the addressee, nor may be copied. If received in error, please contact Sammons Architectural Ltd., 10 Cawdry Buildings, Fountain Street, Leek, Staffordshire. ST13 6JP, United Kingdom or Tel + fax: 01538 386002, or E-mail: info@sammonsltd.co.uk quoting the name of the sender and the addressee, then delete it from your system. Any message sent to an individual at Sammons Architectural, may possibly be read by someone other than the named contact. Any view or opinions presented are solely those of the author and do not represent those of Sammons Architectural Ltd. unless otherwise specifically stated. Please note, opening and using this message is at risk of the recipient.

From: North2 <north2@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Sent: Tuesday, June 4, 2024 11:24 AM
To: Planning <Planning@sammonsltd.co.uk>
Subject: RE: Planning Inspectorate APP/B3438/W/24/3338540: 403 Cheadle Road, ST13 7BH

Dear Teresa,

Thank you for your email.

I confirm that we will agree to an extension for the submission of your final comments. Please submit them by 11 June 2024.

Kind Regards



The Planning
Inspectorate

Michael Joyce Case Officer
The Planning Inspectorate

2 The Square, Temple Quay, Bristol, BS1 6PN

T 0303 444 5395 | E north2@planninginspectorate.gov.uk



@PINSgov



The Planning Inspectorate



planninginspectorate.gov.uk

Ensuring **fairness**, **openness** and **impartiality** across all our services

This communication does not constitute legal advice.

Please view our [Information Charter](#) before sending information to the Planning Inspectorate.

Our [Customer Privacy Notice](#) sets out how we handle personal data in accordance with the law.

From: Planning <Planning@sammonsltd.co.uk>
Sent: Monday, June 3, 2024 12:47 PM
To: North2 <north2@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Planning Inspectorate APP/B3438/W/24/3338540: 403 Cheadle Road, ST13 7BH

Good afternoon, I wondered if it would be possible to secure a short time extension for providing a response to the above? Unfortunately I have only returned to the office today following a short break and the email was received after I had already left. A weeks extension would be all that is required if possible? If you could please let me know by return it would be appreciated.

Kind Regards

Teresa Critchlow BA(Hons), MPlan

For and behalf of



t: 01538 386002 I w: www.sammonsltd.co.uk

10 Cawdry Buildings, Fountain Street, Leek, Staffordshire, ST13 6JP

SAMMONS ARCHITECTURAL Ltd. PRIVACY AND CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

This e-mail is confidential to the intended recipient at the e-mail address to which it has been addressed. It may not be disclosed to, or used by anyone other than the addressee, nor may be copied. If received in error, please contact Sammons Architectural Ltd., 10 Cawdry Buildings, Fountain Street, Leek, Staffordshire. ST13 6JP, United Kingdom or Tel + fax: 01538 386002, or E-mail: info@sammonsltd.co.uk quoting the name of the sender and the addressee, then delete it from your system. Any message sent to an individual at Sammons Architectural, may possibly be read by someone other than the named contact. Any view or opinions presented are solely those of the author and do not represent those of Sammons Architectural Ltd. unless otherwise specifically stated. Please note, opening and using this message is at risk of the recipient.

From: North2@planninginspectorate.gov.uk <North2@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

Sent: Thursday, May 16, 2024 10:50 AM

To: Planning <Planning@sammonsltd.co.uk>

Subject: Planning Inspectorate APP/B3438/W/24/3338540: 403 Cheadle Road, ST13 7BH

The Planning Inspectorate (England)

Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Temple Quay, Bristol, BS1 6PN

The Planning Inspectorate (Wales)

Crown Buildings, Cathays Park, Cardiff, CF10 3NQ

<http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/planninginspectorate>

Twitter: [@PINSgov](https://twitter.com/PINSgov)

This communication does not constitute legal advice.

How we use your information

The Planning Inspectorate takes its data protection responsibilities for the information you provide us with very seriously. To find out more about how we use and manage your personal data, please go to our [privacy notice](#).

[Please take a moment to review the Planning Inspectorate's Privacy Notice which can be accessed by clicking this link.](#)

Please note that the contents of this email and any attachments are privileged and/or confidential and intended solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this email and its attachments, you must take no action based upon them, nor must you copy or show them to anyone. Please contact the sender if you believe you have received this email in error and then delete this email from your system.

Recipients should note that e-mail traffic on Planning Inspectorate systems is subject to monitoring, recording and auditing to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The

Planning Inspectorate has taken steps to keep this e-mail and any attachments free from viruses. It accepts no liability for any loss or damage caused as a result of any virus being passed on. It is the responsibility of the recipient to perform all necessary checks.

The statements expressed in this e-mail are personal and do not necessarily reflect the opinions or policies of the Inspectorate.

DPC:76616c646f72



To help protect your privacy, Microsoft Office prevented automatic download of this picture from the Internet.
Environmental advice image with text saying please consider the environment before printing this email