

APPLICATION NUMBER
APPLICANT'S NAME
LOCATION

SMD/2025/0051
Heronceau Refurbishment Ltd Mr S Edwards
4 Millers View
Cheadle

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

Application for Variation of Condition 3 in relation to application SMD/2024/0241 to change the age range of children accommodated from 8–16 years to 0 - 18 years..

Good Morning,

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to comment on the above application.

I wish to object to the application on the following grounds:

1. Impact upon neighbours – the current plan has already impacted upon a neighbour as their lawn has to be dug up to accommodate the utility requirements. The approval of this plan has also affected the mental health of some residents who no longer feel safe or protected within their own homes. How will the Council address these factors? You will have received fewer responses to this application because local residents no longer believe that they have a voice and that if they do express an opinion they will be subjected to verbal abuse and humiliation.
2. Traffic – residents expressed concern previously about the impact of increased traffic upon the estate which only has one entrance and exit. Children with learning difficulties have higher support needs which means that additional staff may need to be appointed to provide the level of care required to safeguard them. There is no mention of this within the application. There is no pavement in this area = how will carers deal with buggies, pushchairs and prams as they will have to walk on the road? As stated in my previous objection this change in use will result in increased traffic, noise and pollution. This will make our area less safe.
3. Noise – the Environmental Health Report includes a number of excellent recommendations. Will these be taken into account, be conditions of approval and be monitored by the Council?
4. Parking – how will the change of use impact upon parking provision? The application makes no reference to this matter, however, the increase in age means that there will be additional parking requirements.
5. Requirement for an Ambulance Bay – the changes to the application mean that the requirement for an ambulance bay becomes more significant. Studies have shown that “adolescents with ASD utilise the emergency departments 4 times more frequently than non- ASD”
6. Establishment of Need – as stated previously- the Government’s focus is on the development of family homes not the removal of them. The Government

is not supporting the establishment of unregulated children's homes. In fact unregistered children's homes are illegal. Anyone providing care and accommodation to a child in a setting that is not registered with Ofsted when it should be is committing an offence. Ofsted is unlikely to give this home approval for safeguarding reasons and the Local Planning Committee should be aware of this fact before approving the application.

7. Conditions of Approval of Previous Application - The other conditions of the previous planning application have not been met. The applicant is not registered as the owner of this property. The query regarding staff accommodation is not resolved.
8. Police Consultation – given that the Police expressed some concerns about the previous application, they do not appear to have been given the opportunity to comment on the amendment to the original application.
9. Impact on Local Children's Home on Mill Road – there does not appear to be any recognition of the fact that there is an existing operational home 0.4 miles from Millers View. What is being put in place to ensure that this new development does not adversely affect an existing registered home.
10. Errors on Application Form – the applicant has incorrectly stated that development has not already started. This is not true and the form should be amended to state that development has already started and the applicant has received funding.

Megan Richardson

Millbrook Way