

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/24/3351035

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference APP/B3438/W/24/3351035

Appeal By BLOOR HOMES NW

Site Address
Land East of Froghall Road
Cheadle
ST10 2DW
Grid Ref Easting: 401243
Grid Ref Northing: 344858

SENDER DETAILS

Name MR HARRY LEESE

Address
190 Froghall Road
Cheadle
STOKE-ON-TRENT
ST10 2DN

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

For the attention of the Planning Inspector,

On behalf of the residence of 190 Froghall Road, I write in relation to the appeal by Laver Leisure Limited Land East of Froghall Road, Cheadle, reference APP/B3438/W/24/3351035.

As new residents to Froghall Road, we are deeply saddened to hear of the appeal against refusal of planning permission at Land East, behind Froghall Road. This farmed land, which backs onto our property, was a huge attraction when viewing the property and one of the key reasons for purchasing the property. It would be a disgrace to the countryside of Staffordshire to see another area of greenbelt be snatched up by an avaricious corporate company who do not give a damn about the precious habitat they are forever destroying for our ever-decreasing wildlife.

The town of Cheadle has seen an immense increase in new housing in recent years. The traffic flow through Cheadle has been drastically affected because of this; with traffic cues occurring on a daily basis through the high street of Cheadle. Any further residential developments within Cheadle will have a detrimental effect on congestion within the town. This goes without saying the increase in pollution, an additional residential development will cause as a direct cause of added traffic. The small roads through the centre of Cheadle cannot tolerate any more traffic.

At the time this application was first heard, it was rejected on the basis that Cheadle did not have the infrastructure to handle another residential development. What has changed between then and now? Can Laver Leisure Limited evidence any improvements whatsoever?

Furthermore, the town of Cheadle does not have adequate services including GP's, Dentists and Schools, to accommodate a vast increase in the number of residents this development will source. Laver Leisure Limited may advise they will build a School, GP practice and Dentist as part of their development, however I ask how many times have we seen development companies make these promises, only for the plans to be revised once passed and GP's replaced with even more housing? It's all well and good promising to build a GP practice to accommodate an increase in people moving to a town, however the country as a whole does not have enough Doctors to fill these imaginative GP's. Therefore, the problem remains unsolved, and an added burden is created for GP practices' already in the community.

We implore this appeal is rejected permanently by the Planning Inspector.