

Supplementary Objection to Planning Application SMD/2025/0380

Land adjacent to High View, Sutherland Road, Longsdon, Staffordshire ST9 9QD

Submitted by: Mr and Mrs Holden

Address: High View, Sutherland Road, Longsdon, ST9 9QD

Date: 29/11/25

1. Misrepresentation of Access – “Shared Entrance” Claim

We wish to formally raise a serious concern about a **factual inaccuracy** in the amended planning application (November 2025) for SMD/2025/0380. The application now states that access to the proposed dwelling will be via a **“shared entrance” with High View**. This claim is **entirely false** and must be corrected immediately for the following reasons:

- The entrance and driveway serving the applicant’s land is **not shared** with High View. It is a **separate access track**, constructed **after High View was built**, and it is entirely **independent of our property and title**.
- We have reviewed the **official Title Register for High View**, and there is **no mention of a shared access, easement, or covenant** under **Section B (Proprietorship Register)** or **Section C (Charges Register)**.
- At the time of sale, September 2020, **no legal documentation** or land registry entries referenced any shared rights of way or obligations.
- The **driveway in question was constructed in 2011** (after High View was built) and subsequently required a **retrospective planning application**, in which the applicant **explicitly stated the drive was for agricultural access** only.

This false claim of a shared entrance is not only misleading but potentially legally actionable. It must be **formally retracted** by the applicant and corrected in the planning documentation.

2. Contradictory Land Use Statements – Garden vs Agricultural

In addition to the misleading access claim, we highlight a **second major inconsistency** in the current application:

- The application describes the land as **“garden land”**. This is **factually incorrect** and **contradicts earlier applications and planning history**, including the 2011 retrospective access approval.
- The land is, and always has been, **classified as agricultural**. It was leased as an **allotment**, not as a garden or domestic curtilage.
- To date, **no application has been submitted to change the use of the land from agricultural to garden land**, and **no lawful development certificate or planning permission** has been granted for such a change.

This inconsistency, alongside the use of the wording 'shared access with High View, is significant. By **presenting the land as garden land**, the applicant appears to be seeking to benefit from more favourable planning interpretations (e.g., claiming the site as part of a domestic curtilage for infill). This is not supported by the land's planning status, historic use, or legal documentation. The suggestion that access is shared suggests that it is for domestic purposes, rather than the intended agricultural.

Conclusion and Action Requested

We request that the planning authority:

1. **Formally disregard the claim of shared access** in the application and require the applicant to correct this in writing with immediate effect.
2. **Confirm that no planning permission exists** for a change of use from **agricultural land to garden land**, and therefore that any representation of the site as garden is **materially misleading**.
3. Treat this as a **breach of planning integrity** and ensure that future representations of the site's history and access are **accurate and legally grounded**.

These issues materially affect both **our property rights** and the **assessment of planning policy compliance**. We trust that these will be taken seriously in your decision-making process.

Mr And Mrs Holden