

Mr G Richards and Miss G Grocott

133 Station Road

Cheddleton

ST13 7EE

26/03/2024

To whom it may concern,

We are writing to log our formal objection to the planning application, reference; SMD/2024/0089 at 135 Station Road, Cheddleton, ST13 7EE.

We wish to object to the aforementioned planning application on the grounds of the following;

1. The scale and proportion of the plans is incorrect in regards to the boundary lines, along with the retaining wall for the land not being shown in the plans. There is also no clear scale for the proposed development as the garden would be significantly reduced but this is not shown in the plans provided.
2. Inaccuracy of the plans with regards to the current position of the garage, which is proposed to be demolished, as this shows to be a significant distance from the boundary, whereas it is actually less than 1 foot away from the boundary and the retaining wall for the land at the rear, please see images 1,2 and 3. The plans show that the rear wall of the existing garage is forward of the rear wall of the existing dwelling which is wholly inaccurate as Image 4 shows, the rear wall of the garage is actually behind the line of the existing dwelling
3. The demolition of the existing garage is assumed to include removal of foundations for the garage. This presents a risk to our existing retaining wall. As can be seen in images 1 and 2, the proximity of the existing garage wall is a matter of centimetres away and we need assurances that any disturbance to our wall as a result of the demolition work will be made good by the applicant at their cost. We believe that the Party Wall Act of 1996 applies. Irrespective of the current condition of that wall, the proximity of the existing building prevents proper reasonable examination. As the applicants are making the changes they should bear responsibility for the consequences of the demolition. The risk involved with the demolition of the garage could result in significant subsidence of the land at the rear of the properties 133 and 135 Station Road.
4. The applicant has declared that there is no altered pedestrian access to or from the public highway, when in fact the plans show building over the existing right of way for 133 Station Road as is stated in the title deed, along the rear and east side of the property, please see images 4, 5 and 6.
5. The plans would need to show an altered right of way to the rear of the property for 133 which is not outlined in the plans, and would require an answer of yes to the question "is there new or altered pedestrian access proposed to or from the public highway" to which they have answered no.
6. Any pedestrian access is not clear and obvious, and there are concerns that it could impact existing services as any proposed exit is near an existing telegraph pole, and there is also

water access at the point of any access way. The main concern is that there would be reasons not to carry out the continuance of the right of way for 133 Station Road.

7. The proposed development limits the disabled access to the property, as there is a front elevation which has steps, this is not accessible, the only disabled access to the property 133 Station Road is using the right of way along the north and east sides.
8. In relation to the question "is there new or altered vehicle access to or from the public highway?" they are proposing to alter the existing driveway and have answered no to the question on the form, please see image 8, 9 and 10.
9. In combination with points 6 and 8, these changes will directly affect current parking arrangements on the highway, as currently there is a car parking space to the south along the existing wall, please see image 7, which is used by a number of residents, to which they have declared there will be no change to parking arrangements.
10. There is a loss of privacy to the garden at the rear of the property which belongs to 133 Station Road, as the proposed second story elevation would look over the garden, which it falls in line with.
11. There is a risk of light restriction to the property at 133 Station Road due to the extension, as the light into the garden may be limited.
12. We are of the understanding that there is an existing sewage pipe under the proposed build which may cause issues with the drainage system if not properly worked around.
13. There is also a proposed additional two bathrooms to be added to the property which could cause issues with the existing drainage systems which are shared utilities.
14. There is a concern with the disposal of residential waste, as the bins for 133 have to be stored at the rear of the property as there is nowhere to store the bins at the front of the property due to the elevated front garden, the bins are currently taken down the right of way to be emptied. If this was blocked, the bins would have to be stored on the public highway, which could cause a potential road hazard.
15. There are impacts to the traffic along the road, as the road is used for heavy goods vehicles servicing the adjacent industrial estate, which already have to use a narrowed road due to on-road parking. If the proposed works went ahead, there is a risk to the traffic, as the lorries may not have room to manoeuvre or reverse if there is any oncoming traffic. This would also affect residents due to the build-up of traffic outside homes.
16. Another concern is where any contractors vehicles will be parked during the undertaking of this work and what disruption that will cause to the neighbourhood. We would anticipate that a certain amount of parking will be required on site along with skips etc. Where will these be sited as the roadway would not be an appropriate place. Whilst not directly related the application, in our view this should be considered too.

We hope you will take our points into consideration when processing the planning application.

Yours sincerely,

Mr G Richards and Miss G Grocott



Image 1 Rear of garage to be demolished and retaining wall for land at rear of 133 and 135 Station Road.



Image 2 Zoomed in rear of garage to be demolished and retaining wall for land at rear of 133 and 135 Station Road.



Image 3 Rear of garage to be demolished and retaining wall for land at rear of 133 and 135 Station Road.



Image 4 Existing right of way used along the rear of 133 and 135 Station Road.



Image 6 Existing right of way along the east side of 135 from the highway.



Image 5 Existing right of way along the east side of 135 Station Road from the access gate.



Image 7 Parking spot due to be removed due to proposed works (removal of wall).

Pedestrian and Vehicle Access, Roads and Rights of Way Is a new or altered vehicle access proposed to or from the public highway? ☐ Yes ☒ No Is a new or altered pedestrian access proposed to or from the public highway? ☐ Yes ☒ No
Planning Portal Reference: PP-12819610
Do the proposals require any diversions, extinguishment and/or creation of public rights of way? ☐ Yes ☒ No
Parking Will the proposed works affect existing car parking arrangements? ☐ Yes ☒ No
Biodiversity net gain Householder developments are currently exempt from biodiversity net gain requirements. However, this exemption still needs to be confirmed by the applicant or agent when making a householder planning permission application. ☒ I/we confirm that the proposed development, if granted permission, would be exempt from the general biodiversity gain condition. Paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) sets out that every planning permission granted for the development of land in England shall be deemed to have been granted subject to the 'general biodiversity gain condition'. However, the 'general biodiversity gain condition' does not apply in relation to planning permission for a development which is the subject of a householder application, within the meaning of Article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
Site Visit Can the site be seen from a public road, public footpath, bridleway or other public land? ☒ Yes ☐ No If the planning authority needs to make an appointment to carry out a site visit, whom should they contact? ☒ The agent ☐ The applicant ☐ Other person
Pre-application Advice Has assistance or prior advice been sought from the local authority about this application? ☐ Yes ☒ No
Planning Portal Reference: PP-12819610

Image 8 The plans where questions have been incorrectly answered.



Image 9 Existing driveway suitable for only one car width due to hedges.



Image 10 Existing driveway.