

**From:**  
**To:** [Planning Comments \(SMDC\)](#)  
**Subject:** SMD/2025/0243 Objection 3  
**Date:** 02 July 2025 21:14:45

---

2 July 2025

Dear Sirs,

## OBJECTION NUMBER 3

to application number SMD/2025/0243

Site address LAND EAST OF MANIFOLD DRIVE AND SOUTH OF RAKEWAY ROAD

## UNNECESSARY DEVELOPMENT AND SPRAWL

The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) 2015 recognises the proposed sites as CH092 & CH096. The same report under sections 4.29 & 4.30 also states both sites as "Unsuitable for development because of landscape quality, intrusion...".

Site Assessment available at [https://www.staffsmoorlands.gov.uk/media/1000/SHLAA-large-sites-details---Cheadle/pdf/Cheadle.FINAL\\_.pdf](https://www.staffsmoorlands.gov.uk/media/1000/SHLAA-large-sites-details---Cheadle/pdf/Cheadle.FINAL_.pdf) state both plots as "Identified in L&SCA as forming part of important landscape setting to settlement. Significant intrusion into open countryside and adjacent to Rakeway House Farm SBI. Manifold Drive provides good strong boundary to development" and "Unsuitable for development because of landscape quality, intrusion into open countryside and adjacent to SBI."

Extending the development of Cheadle by sprawling into existing agricultural land towards Freehay would irreversibly change the boundary and destroy the "green" view for many residents (not just on Rakeway but also from various points within Cheadle, Freehay and the surrounding areas).

The Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment fails to show the situation from 2 Manifold Drive. Photographs have been submitted that were taken at strategic points to lessen the impact of the proposed development on those closest to it. Table 5.1 recognises the scenic quality from Manifold Drive. Table 8.2 then demonstrates the high magnitude of change in years 1 and 15; and a moderate adverse level of effect. All of which demonstrate loss of privacy, view & light and increased pollution (noise, light and air). At times, these are already excessive.

I remain deeply concerned with this point and urge that this proposal be rejected on the grounds stated above.

Yours faithfully,

Darren Whitehead & Joanne Johnson