

Having received a neighbour consultation letter I wish to oppose the above application for the following reasons:

1. A brownfield site is previously developed land that is currently vacant, derelict or unused. This does not apply to this application where the large storage building is still in use so the greenfield site has not become brownfield. The metal structure was erected in the fairly recent past in an agricultural field. It is surrounded by hard standing. The application does not protect or benefit the countryside as per the applicant's claim.
2. Outline planning permission gives no indication of size or style of dwelling. It is concerning that Class 3 has three categories, and in some cases its use can benefit from permitted development rights, allowing a change of use without requiring a full planning application.
3. The statement that the dwelling would have no impact on the landscape is untrue. It would not be part of an established residential cluster as indicated in the application. It would be a new building, not a replacement. The established homes which are set back from the road have either been there for many years or are replacement dwellings. The site of the proposed dwelling has fields on either side so would not be a continuation of the development.
4. The previous planning application for this site, SMD/2025/0419, was refused, one of the reasons being "The location of this proposed development is found to be unsustainable due to its remoteness from any village, town or other service centre that could provide essential services for residential occupiers. The nearest source of shops and services is either the larger village of Upper Tean, a distance of 2.8km, or the town of Cheadle, a distance of 4km. A significant part of these journeys would necessarily be by narrow unlit rural roads with no pavement. This is contrary to SMDC Local Planning Policies SS2, SS10, DC1, H1 and T1 and to the NPPF." The location remains unchanged and there is no public transport to the site.
5. The previous application was refused as it did not demonstrate essential locational need. One single dwelling is not a logical and sustainable opportunity for residential development as it would have no relationship with existing properties and would not use previously developed land and buildings. The metal storage building is still there. Prior use of the site was a field where cattle grazed. One dwelling would not help SMDC's 5 year housing supply targets as per page 6 of the application.

In addition, the applicant's own property is for sale which renders the future plans for the site questionable.