

Erection of detached bungalow with associated landscaping, car parking and boundary treatment | Land To The Rear Of 40-50 Belgrave Road Moston
Manchester M40 3ST

Appeal Statement

Prepared by:

Civitas Planning Limited
Riverside House
Brymau Three Estate
River Lane
Saltney
Chester
CH4 8RQ

Tel: 01244 682 509

1.1. Introduction

1.2. This appeal is made against the decision of Manchester City Council to refuse application REF: 127493/FO/2020

1.3. The application was refused for the following reasons:

1) The erection of a bungalow would result in the loss of local open space and green infrastructure together with an unduly harmful impact on the visual amenity value of the application site in the wider open space context of Moston Brook. The proposal would therefore erode local character and fail to integrate successfully into the local area. As such, the proposal will be unduly harmful to the visual amenity of the site and the local landscape character. The proposal is therefore contrary to Saved Unitary Development Plan (1995) Policy BM4, Policies SP1, H1, EN1, EN9, EN10 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012), the Guide to Development in Manchester SPD (2007), the Residential Guidance (2016) and the National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Policy Guidance.

2) The proposed development by reason of its location to the rear of an existing dwellinghouses and without its own road frontage constitutes 'backland' development. Due to the siting of the proposed building and its relationship with adjoining properties there would be a loss of amenity to neighbouring occupiers as consequence of increased levels of activity, associated noise and disturbance, intrusiveness and loss of privacy. The proposal would therefore be harmful to surrounding residential amenity. As such, the proposed development is contrary to saved policies DC6.1, DC6.2 and DC1.1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and policies DM1, EN1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

1.4. This statement sets out the Appellant's case in the context of the above reasons for refusal.

2. Grounds of Appeal

2.1. The first reason for refusal relates to the Council's view that the proposed development would result in a harmful impact in the wider open space context of Moston Brook. Whilst the site is within the wider Moston Brook River Valley, it does not currently represent a site that is characteristic of the Valley. The site is an area of closed off hardstanding and is therefore previously developed land within the Valley, not specifically part of the Valley. The appeal site has no value as a recreational open space and to develop it as proposed would improve its visual amenity in the context of the open space with a high quality dwelling and associated landscaping, as opposed to an area of hardstanding/eye scrubland. The appeal quite simply does not have a semi

natural or natural character as suggested by the Council. The photos within Appendix of the Appellant's original planning statement demonstrate this, this will also be clear from any site visit undertaken by the Inspector.

- 2.2. The Appellant is firmly of the view that the proposed development will represent a visual improvement whilst also delivering a dwelling in a sustainable location.
- 2.3. The second reason for refusal relates to the Council's view that the proposed development represents a form of unacceptable 'backland' development. Saved Policy DC6 states that the Council will not normally grant consent for residential development on "backland" sites, that is, sites with limited access to a road because they are surrounded by housing or other uses. The application is technically to the rear of some dwellings, but it is not within the rear garden of any properties, it is divorced and separated from the rear gardens of the properties on Belgrave Road. However, the above policy is assessed against the proposed development below.

- a. there is no loss of privacy to adjoining dwellings and associated rear gardens;

As the application site is some distance away from other dwellings, and the fact that the proposed development is a bungalow means that there will be no loss of privacy to any rear gardens. The application site is quite clearly divorced from the properties on Belgrave Road.

- b. access and parking arrangements do not significantly increase noise and disturbance for occupiers of existing adjoining dwellings;

As has been previously mentioned, the adjacent residential development means that there is already a residential use in the immediate vicinity of the application site. The addition of a bungalow in this location will not result in any significant noise and disturbance for the nearby dwellings.

- c. the scale and design of the development is compatible with the character of buildings in the surrounding area;

The scale of the dwelling is modest and is clearly compatible with the character of the buildings in the surrounding area.

- d. there is sufficient space between the proposed and existing dwellings to avoid problems of significant overshadowing or of over dominant appearance affecting either the existing or the proposed dwellings;

As mentioned above, the modest design and distance away from other dwellings means that there will be no over dominance or overshadowing as a result of the development.

- e. the proposal does not involve the loss of important trees or other natural features of high amenity value or the loss of locally important wildlife habitats;

The trees surrounding the site are to be retained as part of the proposals, as well as supplemented with new landscaping. The application site is a large area of hardstanding, the built development will be placed on this area of hardstanding. There will be no loss of any important tree or wildlife habitats as part of the proposals.

- f. the proposed and existing dwellings retain adequate levels of private amenity space; and

As shown on the associated plans, ample garden/private space is provided within the layout. This area will not be overlooked by any other properties.

- g. in the case of development within a Conservation Area, in particular, the built form and the surrounding spaces maintain or enhance the character of the area.

The development is not within a conversation area.

2.4. The Council's second reason for refusal also refers to the introduction of a residential use to the rear of Belgrave road and the impact this will have on neighbouring properties. As mentioned within the Appellant's supporting planning statement, there already is a residential use directly adjacent to the appeal site. The Appellant contests that the addition of one further dwelling in this location will not result in an impact that will significantly change the character/nature of uses to the rear of Belgrave Road.

2.5. In terms of the design/character of the dwelling and its relationship with the area. There are many different types of dwelling along Belgrave Road, including one storey bungalows such as the one proposed. The materials proposed have been selected to match the materials of the local area's architectural style.

2.6. It is of note that there were technical objections to the application from statutory consultees.

3. Conclusion

3.1. For the reasons set out within this statement, it is therefore respectfully requested that this appeal is upheld and that planning permission is allowed.

