
From:
Sent: 29 July 2021 12:27
To: Planning (SMDC)
Subject: SMD/2021/0210 Greywoods Objection
Attachments: GV 277223 Schematic G.pdf; DARREN PRICES STATEMENT 2ND ISSUE.docx

Categories:

Dear Ms Curley,

With reference to the revision of the drawing for this application, I wish to object in the strongest possible terms, on grounds of DC1 and DC3.

I also request that the decision is deferred to no earlier than September's meeting, as the letter notifying this amendment was only received by post on Friday 22 July. Dated 16th July, this effectively took a whole week from the consultation period, in a period when many people are on holiday or impacted by Covid related troubles. Furthermore, the application is appearing to 'drip feed' new documentation on to the planning portal, with three additional documents being submitted after the notifying letter. How can objectors know when all documents have been posted, and when they are able to submit their final objections? This appears wholly unsatisfactory.

- 1) The previous application ([SMD/2020/0645](#)) was refused for a number of reasons significantly including its impact on privacy and daylight and its overbearing nature on neighbouring Croxteth. This latest revision does not address these points. The dwelling may (or may not) have moved fractionally – from the drawings it is not possible to determine, but the substantive issues are not addressed.
- 2) The building line at the rear of Croxteth is breached. Only the conservatory/dining room of neighbouring Croxteth makes the building line appear to be further North than it is.
- 3) The first floor rear windows of the proposed dwelling, (and any side windows) will view in to the conservatory of Croxteth resulting in a gross invasion of privacy.
- 4) The dwelling, despite the revision's inference of having a hipped roof will greatly diminish the daylight of Croxteth, most notably its conservatory (dining area).
- 5) The space about dwellings minimums are not complied with vertically for Croxteth, with the conservatory/dining room being most affected by lack of privacy and daylight. In order to accommodate the space about dwelling requirements in respect of Greywoods, the proposed dwelling is sited sufficiently away, however the proposed dwelling is very much nearer to Croxteth than to Greywoods – approximately only 4metres. Being closer to Croxteth our calculations show the regs will not be met with any two storey building which extends beyond the building line. (See attached)
- 6) The space about buildings regulations are also being breached horizontally due to the Northwards projection of the proposed dwelling beyond the building line of the rearmost brick wall of Croxteth. Light (and privacy) will undoubtedly be impacted from the Croxteth conservatory/dining room by having the gable end of the proposed dwelling approximately 4m away from these primary windows.
- 7) The plot size is small in nature, especially the short dimension of its frontage, and not inkeeping with the local vernacular. Croxteth is a stand out example of a small plot on Birchall Lane and should not be used as a comparison. Nor should any averages consider the infill properties to the north of Croxteth.
- 8) In order to fit in to the small plot size an insubstantive dwelling is proposed which will not be inkeeping with the local vernacular, especially if a garage is enclosed within its footprint. If a garage is not to be incorporated within the submitted footprint, then future over-development may occur by stealth.
- 9) Again, this revision only shows outline. No details are submitted (again). One resultant factor of this is that the number of bedrooms, and the number of cars and requirement for turning space cannot be determined. Surely, any approval without the maximum ridge height being known or specified will create problems.
- 10) The existing hedge is being removed. The replacement hedge will take a number of years to provide similar levels of biodiversity, and privacy between the existing Greywoods house and the proposed dwelling.

11) The continued endeavours to overdevelop Birchall Lane will result in a unique area of Leek being destroyed forever.

I also query why it is necessary to raise the ground level by 485mm, which exacerbates the issues of daylight and privacy. Issues relating to surface water should be solved via better drainage not elevation.

There are also incorrect statements made within the Access Statement – Rev D:

- As tested rigorously and recently in law, there is no longer a presumption in favour of development. This has been made clear to the applicant by the committee in previous sessions. (See Cllr Darren Prices statement, attached, which remains relevant, read out during the committee meeting for application SMD/2020/0645 in February)
- The statement says that there will be no loss of light or privacy to Croxteth. This is demonstrably untrue. Both vertically and horizontally, the proposed dwelling does not meet the Space About Dwellings criteria.

I urge a delay of one month to the committee hearing, and a recommendation of refusal of this application.

Regards

Jim Willshaw