

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 February 2026 18:00
To: Planning (SMDC)
Subject: Re: Planning Application SMD/2026/0028 – Hillswood Lodge

[REDACTED]

Dear Sir or Madam,

Re: Planning Application SMD/2026/0028 – Hillswood Lodge

We are writing to formally object to the latest proposed plans for Hillswood Lodge under the above planning reference.

My objection is based on the following material planning considerations:

1. Excessive Roof Height and Visual Impact

The proposed roof line is excessively high and would be clearly visible from our bedroom window. This would result in an overbearing and intrusive development that would have a significant adverse impact on our residential amenity.

2. Light Pollution

The proposed rear-facing lighting would be directly visible from our bedroom window. Given the nature of the development, it is likely that this lighting would remain on throughout the night, resulting in unacceptable levels of light pollution and disturbance during night-time hours.

3. Noise Disturbance from Rear Patio and Staff Activity

The plans include a rear patio area where staff are likely to gather. This area is positioned close to neighbouring residential properties and would be a direct source of noise from conversation, movement, and general activity. Such noise would be particularly disruptive during evenings and night-time periods and would significantly harm the quiet enjoyment of our home.

4. Failure to Provide Previously Advised Screening

In February 2019, planning officer Steve Massey advised the applicant that quick-growing laurel planting should be installed along the boundaries, with the expectation that these would reach approximately 4.2 metres in height within 5–10 years to provide adequate screening. Despite this advice following refusal of the previous application, the applicant has still not implemented this planting in the seven years since that decision. This failure to provide agreed mitigation measures gives little confidence that neighbouring residential amenity will be adequately protected under the current proposal.

5. Concerns Regarding Tree Root Removal and Tree Stability

The submitted tree report suggests that only 7% of tree roots would be removed as part of the proposed works. However, we have consulted an independent tree surgeon who considers that the actual level of root disturbance is likely to be greater than stated and that removal of roots on a tree of this size could lead to instability and potential safety risks. We request that the council carefully

scrutinise the submitted arboricultural assessment and, if necessary, seek independent verification before any approval is granted.

6. Presence of Ash Dieback

A tree specialist has also advised that ash dieback disease is present in affected trees on or near the site. We therefore ask what the council's understanding is regarding the condition and management of these trees, and what measures should properly be taken to ensure public safety and appropriate management before development proceeds. This issue should be fully assessed as part of the planning decision.

The combination of excessive height, light spill, noise from the rear patio area, inadequate screening, and unresolved tree safety concerns would lead to a substantial and unreasonable loss of residential amenity. In our view, the proposal fails to adequately mitigate these impacts or to respect the character and living conditions of neighbouring properties.

For these reasons, we respectfully request that the application be refused or substantially amended to address the issues outlined above.

Yours faithfully,

Nicholas and Clare Smith

[Sent from the all-new AOL app for iOS](#)