
From: Planning Comments (SMDC)
Subject: FW: GREYWOODS - SMD/2021/0210

From: Antony Matthews
Sent: 03 August 2021 22:28
To: Planning (SMDC) <Planning@staffs Moorlands.gov.uk>
Subject: GREYWOODS - SMD/2021/0210

Dear Planning Officer.

We write to submit our strong objections to the new proposed indicative plan.

1. Several indicative plans for properties on this garden have been declined for various reasons. So whether or not some or all of the reasons for objection are claimed to have been addressed by moving the proposed house to this latest position, on the contrary, that does not justify it being described as a good plan at all. In fact transgression of planning laws on this area arise with this latest plan.
2. They show where the proposed house 'could be', (but council seem to concede it cannot be closer to Greywoods) shown in the schematic 'H'. This latest positioning causes infringement of amenity, daylight and space to Croxteth's principal dining room, this being against the council's own rules.
3. Due to the above, the roofline has to be low and a hip type, being out of keeping with the distinct style and type of the area.
4. Removal of existing hedge - The application does not demonstrate a net gain or improvement in bio-diversity. IE, it needs to show a better habitat and more planting than it currently does to be sustainable. This is a requirement to comply with the council's own rules and local plan.
5. Space around properties has been taken as the minimum (less than the minimum on the elevation bordering Croxteth). In an area such as this, with spacious surroundings appropriate for the grand presentation of Greywoods, this minimum provides an out of balance effect in this very large site incorporating the magnificence of Greywoods. It's quite out of keeping and the grandeur of Greywoods cannot avoid being diminished. Whereas. planning rules state that planning permission should not have any harmful effect.
6. Also, acceptable measurements of space around properties are stipulated exactly, not an inch more or less. No leeway is granted in anyone's brief, as is clear to the Inspector.
7. If there are other objections you have submitted before, you may feel you need to repeat them especially regarding the inappropriate use of the gardenland spoiling the setting of this majestic property which needs to retain the whole area in order that the presentation of its grandeur is maintained and not harmed by degrading with this added, and squashed in, additional property.

It is not possible to diminish that area of land without harming excellent qualities of Greywoods which have always been in existence. Furthermore, the impact of a new dwelling anywhere in the garden of Greywoods will fail to improve Greywoods. To the contrary it could not avoid causing harm to it, which again is against planning regulations.

PART TWO

- 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 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 to Jim Wilshaw's objection submissions)
- 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. Horizontally, the proposed dwelling does not meet the Space About Dwellings criteria.

Mr. A.J. and Mrs N. Matthews
 Innisfree, Birchall Lane. Leek.
 Sent from my iPhone