

[REDACTED]

From: planningcomments@staffs Moorlands.gov.uk
Sent: 29 April 2026 18:41
To: Planning Comments (SMDC)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access

Application Reference No. : SMD/2026/0170 Site Address: Land South Of Turners Pasture Cheadle Staffordshire
ST10 1UN Comments by: Steve & Jo Hamer

From:

53.
Ness Grove
Land off Turners Pastures
Cheadle
Staffordshire
ST10 1TA

Phone: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Submission: Objection

Comments: Application number SMD/2026/0170

Application Variation SMD/2020/0563

To whom it may concern,

We are writing to inform you that we are not satisfied in the least with the outcome stated in the Planning Statement dated 17/04/26, written by Rob Duncan, Planning Consultancy. In the conclusion of the document, it states that 'The proposed variation of conditions 2 and 14 of application SMD/2020/0536 to regularise the siting of Plot 1 is acceptable in planning terms' and that 'The re-sited dwelling does not cause any material harm to neighbouring residential amenity'.

We would like to bring to your attention that this is false, as we have had severe light reduction because of plot 1 being built too close through blatant disregard for the plans which should never have been agreed upon in the first instance. Ironically, the position in which Plot 1 has been built seems to have followed the initial planning application dated 19/01/21, an application which was initially refused due to its close proximity, hence, Revision C was proposed and approved.

May we also bring to your attention the sheer height of the plot 1 in comparison to the dwellings 51 & 53 Ness Grove. There are also concerns over the ground height differences, also the issues with possible drainage issues that are potentially caused by this. With regard to the light deprivation we have experienced in our kitchen since the building on Plot 1, point 5.10 states 'residential amenity, in terms of satisfactory daylight, visual impact, sunlight.' Yes, we have a pergola, however, the height of the apex of plot 1 bungalow has surpassed the height of our garage considerably, therefore blocking out daylight and sunlight. Can I point out the 'right to light' law, which I presume you are familiar with. We also have a visual impact from the bedroom windows at the rear elevation of our house because of the apex height.

In point 5.15 in the Planning Statement, it once again wrongly states 'no.53 Ness Grove has a small single storey projection from its rear elevation, but note that this part of their rear elevation does not face directly towards the side elevation of the property on Plot 1 and thus no conflict with the Space About Dwellings SPG arises.' Our single storey extension is not on the rear elevation but the side of our property and has a large window overlooking our back garden and patio, since plot 1 has been built we now have a clear view into the windows at the front of plot 1 bungalow. Therefore, when sitting on the patio or in our garden we have the same view into plot 1 bungalow's front window and are overlooked due to the fact that the property has been built too high 'Plot 1 front elevation windows are level with our garage roof and a lot higher than our house windows. These facts are also in contrast to

the statements written in point 5.10, where it clearly states 'Policy DC1 of the Local Plan seeks to ensure that new development protects the amenity of the area, including creation of healthy active environments and residential amenity, in terms of satisfactory daylight, visual impact, sunlight, outlook, privacy' and in point 5.12 'The objective of that guidance is to provide privacy for existing and proposed residents and the protection of their amenities to allow reasonable enjoyment of their residence and garden, with a degree of freedom from unwanted social contact.' Have these policies been written for a purpose? If so, shouldn't they be abided by?

In conclusion, we strongly suggest that the proposed variation of conditions 2 and 14 of application SMD/2020/0536 to regularise the siting of Plot 1 is wholly unacceptable in planning terms 'the plans were not followed. The re-sited dwelling does cause considerable material harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, and it does cause material harm to neighboring residential amenity, daylight and privacy. Therefore, we respectfully request that the revised application be refused by the Local Planning Authority.

Yours sincerely

Mr Stephen Hamer and Mrs Joanne Hamer

Do you really need to print out this Email? Be green - keep it on the screen.

This email is intended for the addressee(s) only and may contain sensitive, privileged or confidential information that could be protectively marked. If you are not the addressee please do not use the information in any way. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it from your system. Thank you.

The Council may be required to disclose this email or any responses to it under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. The way in which we handle personal information is set out in our privacy notice and is available at <https://www.staffs Moorlands.gov.uk/YourData>
