



STATEMENT OF CASE

12 MANOR ROAD
MANCHESTER
M19 3EE

ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS TO AN EXISTING DWELLING.

Appendix

Please refer to the following documents:

- 2023.10.24 - MAN012 – Binder containing plans originally submitted WD 2.1 – WD 2.2, WD3.1 – WD3.3, WD5.1 – WD5.4, WD9.1 – 9.4
- 2023.10.24 - MAN012 - Site Plan Sketch containing plan WD 2.2 annotated.
- Site photos take from Barlow Road looking back at terraces showing stepped relationship between subject terraces and Barlow Road numbers 1 – 3
- WD5.5 Elevations - Streetscape

Flocc Studio Ltd.
Studio 157 Harcourt Street
Reddish
SK56UP

07940 123 631
tommy@floccstudio.co.uk
Company Number 11312850



Statement of case for appeal, relating to a householder planning application for the erection of a double storey side extension to form additional living accommodation.

Prepared by Flocc Studio Limited on
Behalf of Christopher Kay & Chantelle Van Den Boom
5.02.2024

Contents

- Section 1 Planning History of application site
- Section 2 Timeline for refused householder planning application ref: 138398/FH/2023
- Section 3 Statement of Case.



Section 01: Planning history of application site.

Application address: 12 Manor Road, Levenshulme, Manchester, M19 3EE

The following planning history is documented on Manchester City Councils planning database.

Application Reference	Description	Decision Date	Decision
138398/FH/2023	Erection of two storey side extension to form additional living accommodation.	13/12/23	Refused

Section 02: Timeline for refused householder application 138398/FH/2023

Date	Sender	Recipient	Correspondence or Action
01/11/23	-	-	Application validated with a target decision date being 19/12/23
12/11/23	MCC	Agent	Notification from case officer of intention to visit site
15/11/23	MCC	Agent	Case officer site visit.
29/11/23	MCC	Agent	The case officer has requested the withdrawal of the application citing concerns regarding the overdevelopment of the site. They argue that the proposed extension would disrupt the existing building line along Rushmere Avenue, thus de-establishing its pre-existing character within the street scene.
05/12/23	MCC	Agent	MCC urge Agent to withdraw application.
06/12/23	Agent	MCC	The agent expresses a willingness to collaborate with the council towards achieving a mutually beneficial resolution initially, and seeks clarification regarding the comments regarding 'overdevelopment'. Additional information has been

flocc

			furnished by the agent, confirming that the site coverage does not surpass 50%. Moreover, aerial maps have been provided, illustrating historical precedents in the immediate vicinity where corner sites are situated forward of pre-existing building lines on adjoining streets. Furthermore, the agent has submitted existing and proposed streetscape drawings, demonstrating how the proposed extension aligns harmoniously with the existing street scene.
06/12/23	MCC	Agent	Email from council recording attempts to make unscheduled contact to agent by phone.
07/12/23	Agent	MCC	Agent contacted council to schedule a call back following missed calls.
8/12/23	MCC	Agent	A phone call was received by the planner, requesting the withdrawal of the application, accompanied by suggestions that the client might need to explore the option of relocating to acquire more space.
9/12/23	MCC	Agent	Email from case officer during non business hours recording phone call and requesting confirmation on withdrawal.
11/12/23	Agent	MCC	Agent requests extension of time to discuss councils comments with client.
11/12/23	MCC	Agent	EOT refused by council.
13/12/23	MCC	Agent	Refusal issued prematurely without MCC actively working with the agent to achieve a result favorable to both parties.
14/12/23	Agent	MCC	Further information has been supplied through an aerial photograph, illustrating that the opposite end of the terrace extends forward of the adjoining

flocc

			street. In an effort to circumvent the appeals process, the agent requests a resubmission and requests council reconsider its decision in light of this new information.
18/12/23	MCC	Agent	MCC maintains its disagreement regarding the issuance of the permit prematurely and has indicated that the extensions at 87 & 87A Barlow Road were deemed illegal and subject to pending enforcement actions. However, the agent referenced the original line of enclosure, which is situated forward, rendering MCC's comments irrelevant. MCC advises proceeding with appeals.
19/1/24	Agent	MCC	In a final effort to collaborate with the council, the agent has provided site photos taken at night along with laser measurements. These photos demonstrate that the terraces at the opposite end are even further forward of Barlow Road than the proposed extension.
23/1/24	MCC	Agent	MCC are unwilling to accept the new information.

Section 03: Statement of Case

flocc

This statement of case relates to MCC's decision notice dated 13th December (application ref: 138398/FH/2023) and the purpose of the appeal is to respectfully dispute the reasons for refusal provided in said decision notice.

The application was determined as refused. The reasons for refusal were based upon Manchester's Local Development Framework: Core Strategy - The Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012 -2027 ('the Core Strategy') was adopted by the Council on 11th July 2012. The delegated officers report notes 'Residential/ Visual Amenity' as the primary issues surrounding the development.

Upon thorough deliberation and a careful review of MCC's delegated report, we extend our support for the applicant's decision to appeal the ruling. We believe the decision was unduly harsh and, in accordance with Article 35 (2) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) England Order 2015 (as amended), MCC should have actively engaged with the agent/applicant during the application process. Regrettably, such engagement did not occur; instead, several attempts were made by MCC to compel the withdrawal of the application. The case officer even suggested that the clients might need to consider relocation, a stance we find unreasonable. A 'high-level' timeline of correspondence between the involved parties is provided in 'Section 2

The delegated report notes:

It is considered that the position of the proposed extension along the side garden, close to the back of pavement, comes forward of the established building line along the Rushmere Avenue street scene and thereby would create a visually incongruous development that undermines the established terraces and compromise the character of the Rushmere Avenue street scene

As outlined in the letter to MCC dated December 12, 2023, the proposed extension's alignment with the terraces along Rushmere Avenue may primarily be perceptible from an aerial viewpoint. This alignment adheres to historical norms and reflects local contextual variations. An illustrative instance of such historical alignment can be observed at the far end of the terraces adjacent to the subject site, where they conclude at Barlow Road. Further evidence, including site photos featuring laser measurements, indicates that the proximity between Barlow Road and the terraces on Manor Road is approximately 2.25 meters. Extending towards Rushmere Avenue would harmonize this relationship. A marked-up site plan has been submitted to the council in support of these observations

We do not agree that the proposed extension would introduce an 'incongruous' element to the streetscape. Extensive thought was given during the design phase to the scale and massing, ensuring that the proposal seamlessly integrates with the existing terraces. The window style and detailing have been carefully chosen to align with the surrounding architecture. The proposed architectural style remains consistent with the original dwelling and complements the surrounding streetscape, enhancing the overall aesthetic appeal of

flocc

the area. The development aims to achieve a more harmonious and balanced appearance by replacing the existing low brick fence and garden, which are challenging to maintain.

Based on the outlined rationales, we are of the opinion that the proposed extension aligns with and positively addresses the guidelines set forth in The National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021), as well as policies SP1, DM1, and EN1 of The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document (July 2012). Additionally, it adheres to the saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan (1995) and complies with the directives outlined in the Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance (April 2007).