

Response to Council and 3rd Party Comments

Land at Park Lane, Cheadle

APP/B3438/W/25/3365426

Project	Park Lane, Cheadle
Client	Mr Mark Bullock
Reference	2116
Project Team	Jim Malkin
Version	1
Reviewed by	Jon Imber

Document Produced by:

JMI Planning Limited
62 Carter Street
Uttoxeter
Staffs
ST14 8EU

Phone: 01889 566107
Email: enquiries@jmiplanning.com

www.jmiplanning.com

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Comments on Councils Comments	3
3	Comments on the 3 rd Pary Responses	4
	Mr David Hill	4
	Cllr Peter Wilkinson	4

1 Introduction

- 1.1 JMI Planning is a Midlands based town planning consultancy. Its directors are chartered town planners with over 30 years combined experience in both the public and private sector.
- 1.2 The author of this response, Jim Malkin, has worked as a Principal Planning Officer in local government, and more recently as a planning consultant in the private sector. He has extensive knowledge of the planning system, and experience of the appeals process. He is a member of the Royal Town Planning Institute.
- 1.3 This response should be read in conjunction with the Enforcement Appeal Statement and the report completed by ADC Infrastructure submitted to support the appeal proceedings.

2 Comments on Councils Comments

- 2.1 With regards to the Councils Statement, this has been reviewed, and we feel that it follows the principles of the reasons for refusal and does not add anything further to the case. The reasons for refusal have been fully considered within the previously submitted statement of case.
- 2.2 In relation to paragraph 1.4 the submitted location plan forms the red-line application site plan, not the representative aerial photograph in the Planning Statement.
- 2.3 The inspector will be able to review the viewpoints provided by both the appellant and the Council on their site visit and make an assessment on whether the development will have an impact on heritage assets. The appellants view continues to be that the proposal will have no impact on heritage assets and the setting of the historic town and is fully in compliance with criteria (d) of paragraph 143 of the NPPF.

- 2.4 The appellant welcomes the comments of the Council in Paragraph 6.5 regarding the ecological reason for refusal, where they confirm that *‘in the event the appeal is allowed the LPA can on balance accept the matter be addressed through conditions’*. This is a proportional and pragmatic approach to this matter.

- 2.5 The Appellant is happy with the Councils suggested conditions attached to their statement.

3 Comments on the 3rd Party Responses

Mr David Hill

- 3.1 The vast majority of the comments of the 3rd Party are covered in the previously submitted Statement of Case.
- 3.2 The appellant does however take exception to comment in relation to the erection of a ‘luxury bungalow’. This is patently not the case, no plans have been submitted with regards to the scale of the building and it is clear from the submission that this application proposes an accessible bungalow to meet the needs of Mr Bullock.
- 3.3 The scheme does not ‘flout planning laws’ it is a well thought on scheme which comprises of development on grey belt land which is strongly supported by the Government.

Cllr Peter Wilkinson

- 3.4 The appellant strongly agrees with the comments of Cllr Wilkinson and contends that his interpretation of the planning balance is the correct approach on this application, and one that should have been taken by the Council in making a decision on this application.