Kay, Hayley

From: Planning Comments (SMDC)
Subject: FW: Planning application SMD/2018/0670

From: Dounie Evans [mailto:
Sent: 16 November 2018 09:07
To: Planning (SMDC)
Subject: Planning application SMD/2018/0670

Mr and Mrs Evans
54 Rakeway Road
Cheadle
Stoke-on-Trent
Staffordshire
ST10 1QH

For the attention of Lisa Howard (Case Officer)
Staffordshire Moorlands District Council
Moorlands House
Stockwell Street
Leek
Staffordshire Moorlands
ST13 6HQ 16
November 2018
Dear Sirs

PLANNING APPLICATION NO. SMD/2018/0670

Proposed Garage Extension to side, 52A Rakeway Road, Cheadle, ST10 1QH by Mr and Mrs Plant

We wish to strongly object to the proposal to construct a garage to be located at the side of the house at 52A. We have carefully examined the plans and proposal and, as we live next door at number 54, know the site well.

Firstly, contrary to section 6 of this application, the submitted plans of the proposed garage show that the boundary hedges are clearly "*within falling distance*" of the proposed development. If permitted, this extension would, as a result, lead to the loss of a significant section of the hedgerow located on the boundary between number 54 and number 52A between the properties. In doing so this would render the protective measures, which have purposely in the past been put in place to safeguard them, meaningless.

These hedgerows, home to numerous birds and wildlife, have existed on the boundary for over 25 years and were the subject of a protective planning condition in the permission granted in application no. SMD/2015/0607. Condition 14 stated that "*[w]ithin 1 m of the boundary with no. 54 there shall be no excavation, changes in ground levels, passage of vehicles, storage of materials, equipment or site huts, tipping of chemicals, waste or cement or lighting of fires unless otherwise first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority*". The SMD/2015/0607 applicant, had also submitted an amended plan for number 52A, which reduced the width of the house by 40cm, in an attempt to better protect this boundary hedgerow. Regrettably, even with these measures in place, during the initial construction stages of 52A a large section of the boundary hedge towards the entrance of the property was badly damaged due to the deep nature of the excavations made alongside the hedge. The applicant for this extension should not be allowed the opportunity to cause the permanent loss of this section of hedgerow.

Secondly, the extension would not be in keeping with the layout and density of the buildings in the immediate surrounding area. As included in the recommendation report to SMD/2015/0607, it was noted that the separation distance of 3m between numbers 52A and 54 "*would be sufficient enough to not create a sense of enclosure or diminish the overall impression of spaced apart houses set in sizeable gardens*". If permitted, the location of the proposed extension would mean that the separation distance between the properties would be reduced to almost nothing. This would clearly create a sense of enclosure.

Finally, we also wish to note that if built, the reduction in this separation distance between the properties would lead to the natural light to two of the rooms located on the west side of our house being completely blocked out.

We therefore ask that this permission for this unneighbourly development be rejected for the above reasons, as allowing this would have a significant negative impact on our property. In any event, we would respectfully suggest that there are alternative locations within the plot of 52A which would be better suited for a garage, and have no impact to the hedged boundary with our property and the separation distance between the two properties.

Yours faithfully

Mr and Mrs Evans