

SUPPORTING STATEMENT – 14 MONTCLIFFE CRESCENT MANCHESTER M16 8GR

INTRODUCTION

The resubmitted planning application is for a revised double-storey side extension.

StudioKAZAAD is the agent for this application and we look forward to any discussions with the planning officer. This is in response to a refused planning application dated in September 2020 and the appealed dismissed in August 2021.

SUMMARY

The supporting statement has been prepared to accompany the planning application for the development site on 14 Montcliffe Crescent in Manchester. This is in response to a previous planning application where the proposals were not accepted since the design of the proposal was in a prominent location which would result in an overbearing unacceptable development located within close proximity to back of footpath, particularly on entering and leaving Montcliffe Crescent.

It is considered that this would as a consequence cause a harmful loss of residential amenity to occupiers of surrounding properties and harmful to the character of the area. Furthermore, the proposed development would be detrimental to the amenities of the surrounding properties due to its prominent visibility on Montcliffe Crescent. The proposal would form an incongruous and over dominant feature in the street scene which would be out of character with other properties in the surrounding area to the detriment of the layout of the street.

The new proposals will justify the planning application to demonstrate that the proposal will not contradict relevant planning policies and to show that the scheme will have a beneficial outcome for the surrounding area in terms of a side extension that should work effectively on the streetscene and does not impede on the visual character of the existing detached dwelling.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application relates to a detached two storey dwelling on Moncliffe Crescent. The property is part of a small residential estate, comprised largely of detached and semi-detached houses.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

This application has had a history of refusals for a first-floor extension (both rear and side extension) and seemed they have been concerns over the location of the existing property adjacent to the footpath on Montcliffe Crescent due to its scale and size.

Erection of first floor side extension to form additional living accommodation. Ref. No: 127267/FH/2020 | Validated: Wed 08 Jul 2020 | Status: Refused

Erection of a first-floor rear extension to form additional living accommodation. Ref. No: 086248/FH/2008/S1 | Validated: Wed 26 Mar 2008 | Status: Refused

Erection of a first-floor extension at rear of property. Ref. No: 085582/FH/2008/S1 | Validated: Thu 17 Jan 2008 | Status: Refused

Erection of first floor side and rear extensions to form additional living accommodation. Ref. No: 080373/FH/2006/S1 | Validated: Tue 03 Oct 2006 | Status: Refused

Erection of a first-floor rear extension to form additional living accommodation. Ref. No: 077564/FH/2005/S1 | Validated: Tue 08 Nov 2005 | Status: Refused

Erection of single storey side extension to provide additional living accommodation. Ref. No: 071816/FH/2004/S1 | Validated: Tue 11 May 2004 | Status: Approved

Single storey rear extension. Ref. No: 055259/FH/CENTL1/98 | Validated: Tue 22 Sep 1998 | Status: Approved

Part single, part two storey extension to dwelling house. Ref. No: 052970/FH/CENTL1/97 | Validated: Tue 23 Sep 1997 | Status: Withdraw

REVISED PROPOSED DESIGN

After planning permission for a first-floor side extension has been denied, the applicant has had to find ways to seek planning permission by reducing the size of the extension on the front, rear and side elevation in which the distance between the first-floor side extension and the side boundary is approximately 2.9m. The proposed roof design will be positioned below the existing roof dwelling to maintain the original character of the dwelling and the design will include a gable end wall. The proposed extension and internal alterations will allow for the addition of two bedrooms.

COUNCILS POLICIES ON RESIDENTIAL EXTENSIONS

According to Manchester City Council's Citywide Development Control Policies, DC1.3 and DC1.4, the new proposed first floor side extension adheres to the general character of the property, in which the original dwelling is still maintained.

The proposed side extension should have no effect upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. The planning inspectorate acknowledged that there would not be any overbearing impact on those occupiers or to those of the neighbouring property at the rear.

There is a need to create extra accommodation spaces to enabling people to adapt their houses in appropriate ways to meet changing household needs in which homeowners would prefer to develop their homes than buy a new house.

The proposed side extension should compliment the overall appearance of the dwelling in the street-scene in which this reduces the proposed scale and mass of the extension in which the architectural design selection supports the existing dwelling of the property design framework.

In considering proposals for the first-floor side extension, the Council can ensure that the revised proposals have fulfilled a development potential of the gap between side boundary and the proposed side extension. The actual proposed side extension on the first floor will not be the

creation of a terracing effect, where this would be sympathetic to the character of the street as a whole. The actual or potential result of building the extension will create a large gap between the properties, that brings a strong visual relationship between elements of the buildings involved.

On the side row of houses, 30 Montcliffe Crescent has recently won an appeal to build a two-storey side extension where the scale and size has no impact on the amenity and streetscene and there is no issue with the proposed side extension that is small scale in which the original dwelling will not be affected.

With the economy affected by Covid, many people prefer to extend their existing homes rather than move, and the planning officer needs to acknowledge the struggle for applicants to buy new homes and have to utilise creative ways to accommodate this demand for more living space, but at the same time ensuring that the amenities of neighbours are protected, and that the overall character of the surrounding area is not harmed in which the side extension should have impact on the streetscene with matching materials for brick, roof tiles and window framing.

PARKING

The proposed extension does not affect the parking arrangements in which the garage will remain the same, which means the dwelling is still entitled to two parking spaces on site.

CONCLUSION

After a series of comprehensive consultation with an independent planning consultant, the proposed first floor side extension represents a design alternative has been sensitively and carefully considered; with the considerations, design measures taken to reduce impact and compliance with relevant policies, it is thought the scheme is a positive and viable option that will have very little impact on the amenities of adjoining occupiers, therefore, there seems clear justification to recommend this application for approval.

The proposal would result no redevelopment of an existing dwelling to provide better living conditions in a sustainable location for the applicant's family. This aim would be in accordance with the aims and objectives of local and national policies. In conclusion, it is considered that the proposed redevelopment of the site is in accordance with both local and national planning policies and objectives. **The applicant is open to revised design options and recommended amendments for a first-floor extension during the planning application process in order to achieve planning permission.** The scheme would result in a sustainable development that is in harmony with the locality and would not have a detrimental impact on neighbouring properties according to the proposed drawings submitted to the council.