

Comments for Planning Application 127300/FO/2020

Application Summary

Application Number: 127300/FO/2020

Address: 8 Birch Polygon Manchester M14 5HX

Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension and conversion of property to provide 5 no. self contained apartments with associated elevational alterations, car parking and landscaping

Case Officer: Dave Morris

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Dear Sir,

I write in connection with the above planning application and wish to object in the strongest possible way to the conversion of this House property 5 self-contained flats. I have examined the application submitted by Phillips Planning Services Limited on behalf of Mrs Victoria Griffin and I am familiar with the site since I live at the [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

The current proposal will directly lead to the loss of a large size family house and be detrimental to the character of the area. The street comprises eight large houses. One is an HMO (#1), three are flats (#2, 4 and 12), one is a co-op (#3), one is empty (#10) and one is a family home (#6). It is therefore clear that the conversion of #8 into flats will further undermine the very point of ensuring that the area preserves family home and will be detrimental to the area. The argument made by the applicant that some other properties (#2-4) have been converted into flats recently proves exactly the opposite argument that they are trying to make. That is, no further large properties should be turned in a large number of small flats.

The recent decision on the previous application made by this developer to make it an HMO was turned down on the basis that it should be used as a family. It should remain as a single dwelling. The proposed plan to have one flat comprising three bedrooms completely misses the point as this can hardly house a medium-size family wishing to settle beyond a "starter home" -- these are available all over the place. For a family of four, three bedrooms are expected, but long-term sustainability means that such a family will want two additional room to make play rooms, home

offices/studies, etc. The garden labelled as a "Private Amenity" is hardly a suitable for a family and the plan is therefore a multiple flat conversion in the guise of family housing. People looking for a proper family home will not want of a 5-flat properties. This is missing the point, entirely.

The proposed house extension by 3 meters will bring the house a lot closer to the back wall boundary and our property, thus pushing back the cars towards our property and will also add a large number of cars to the area in addition to an excessive additional number of bins. The small communal garden is a nice touch, but falls short of restoring any decent amount of lost green spaces. There is also no level access to the ground floor, therefore taking away the option of having any occupier with reduced mobility.

As a side note, it is very regrettable to witness continuous re-applications for re-hashed versions of the same basic idea. Such developers are now out-pricing families who wish to buy large family houses to occupy themselves. I personally know of two families trying to buy a family home in the area -- not a flat within an apartment building --, but such houses are very rare and in high demand.

Yours faithfully,

