

Comments for Planning Application 134603/FO/2022

Application Summary

Application Number: 134603/FO/2022

Address: Pellowe House Francis Road Manchester M20 9XP

Proposal: Erection of three storey building to provide 24 apartments following demolition of existing buildings including creation of a new vehicular access from Francis Road, parking provision, landscaping and associated works

Case Officer: Robert Griffin

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I wish to object to the planning application

134603/FO/2022 | Erection of three storey building to provide 24 apartments following demolition of existing buildings including creation of a new vehicular access from Francis Road, parking provision, landscaping and associated works | Pellowe House Francis Road Manchester M20 9XP

I live on Cotton Lane which lies at the northern side of the proposed development. I have lived here for around 16 years.

I would like to object on the following grounds.

- Height and massing of proposed development leading to loss of light and over shadowing.
- Reduced privacy
- Over development of the land
- Lack of amenity space in the proposed development.

1: Height and massing of proposed development leading to loss of light and over shadowing

The rear of my house is south facing and the rear garden enjoys southern light for a good proportion of the day. The new development (at approx 9m) will see an increase in height from the current building (at approx 6m) by around a third. This is a significant and detrimental increase in height and will have a negative impact on both the outlook from the rear of our house and also increase the amount of shadowing - especially in the winter months. The sun path study in the

Design and Access Statement is very vague but even so it is clear that our south facing gardens , especially with low winter sun , will be significantly affected by shadowing from the new development. The new development comes up hard to the boundaries of mine and my neighbours properties and we will be presented by a very large and dominant gable wall - much more dominant and oppressive than the current building. There is a Right To Light enshrined in British law and I believe this development is depriving me and my neighbours this right to light. Any new development on this site should improve our Right to Light and not make it worse. There seems to have been no consideration in the planning application of the visual impact this development will have on myself and my neighbours and the subsequent loss of light.

It is not my place to design the building for the developer but if the building was set back further from our boundary line, with the flats above the under pass removed and the building line finishing where it does at ground floor level then over shadowing will be reduced.

2: Reduced privacy

Because the new development comes up hard upon the boundary of my property, and because of the height of the new development, the flats on the first and second floor at the rear of the new development will be overlooking into my garden and rear windows. The current building is industrial and privacy has never been an issue but with the new development now being residential this is now an issue. I don't believe enough consideration has been made in the application to this over looking and the potential loss of privacy to myself and the residents of Henwood Road, The gable on the North West elevation also includes two windows at first and second floor level that potentially over look myself and my neighbours - once again leading to a reduction in privacy.

3: Over development of the land.

Whilst I appreciate the need for more housing in this area many of the problems with this application are because of the over development of this site. Two previous applications - in 2005 and 2006 - proposed less accommodation on this site. The 2005 application 074755/FO/2005/S2 was withdrawn and the 2006 application 077190/FO/2005/S2 was refused. One of the main reasons for refusal was over development of the site and yet that proposal had less accommodation than this current application. Simply put, the developer is trying to put too much accommodation on a small site and as such it is impacting not only on the quality of the accommodation itself but on myself and my neighbours. Whilst things have changed since 2006 the reasons for refusal still stand and in some regards are even more pertinent. If an application was refused in 2006 because of over development then surely an application which increases the size of a development should also be refused?

Frankly, this building is too high. The designers have seemingly used 30 Cotton Lane as the height at which to aim for but 30 Cotton Lane is the exception rather than the rule in this area. 30 Cotton Lane is unusually high - being three storeys when every other house in this area is two storeys. This new development will be, by far, the largest building in area and will be overpowering

in both scale and mass to the surrounding buildings. It is an inappropriately large building in an area of mostly modest semi detached houses.

4. Lack of amenity space in the proposed development.

As well as the negative impact on myself and my neighbours, in a more general sense, this is a very poor development in terms of the quality of the accommodation and amenity space, or lack thereof, provided. The flats are themselves very small and whilst they are aimed at the 'affordable' market they only just meet or barely exceed the minimum space standards for new developments. None of the flats have private outside space or balconies. The proposed 'private gardens' at ground level on Francis Road are nothing of the sort - being nothing more than a tiny piece of hard landscaping which, if the renders are to be believed, have a badly thought out tree placed blocking any light into their living rooms.

To the rear is an apparent 'communal amenity space' but it is nothing more than a bench and a tiny bit of grass looking out onto a car park. Is this the best the developer can offer to its potential residents? Has the lock down not taught us anything about the need for good quality outdoor space in new developments? This lack of amenity space is now to be expected in city centre developments but surely we can do better in the suburbs? Or do owners of 'affordable housing' not deserve good outdoor space?

There is also the issue of water permeability. The industrial building on this site currently offers no water permeability so any new development should surely improve the situation by offering good quality natural landscapes beyond a tiny bit of grass? Whilst the inclusion of PV panels is a positive this building does not seem to take sustainability very seriously.

In conclusion, whilst I have no strong objections to this site being redeveloped I believe this application should be refused because of the loss light and privacy suffered by myself and my neighbours, an over development of the site and for the poor quality of amenity spaces in this proposal.

As a further note - the Statement of Community Planning report by Maddox Planning was slightly disingenuous and not fully truthful with regards consultation outcomes. The report states:

"Out of the 117 homes and businesses that were consulted, only three responses were received (a <3% response rate) with only one objection. The objection did not give any reasons beyond stating being against the proposed development. The applicant did contact the respondent through Maddox Planning, in seeking to understand what the objection was specifically related to, but no further response was received."

I am not sure if the person they referred to was myself but I strongly objected to the pre application and after contacting Maddox Planning I then entered into long and involved negotiations with Step Places about the scheme. My objections mainly centred around access to the site, which was initially proposed to cross my property, and after negotiations my objections were so strong and

well founded it led to a redesign of the scheme.

The report implies there was little or no opposition from neighbours at pre application phase but I can assure there was , from me at least, so would like to set that record straight.

Despite them redesigning the scheme to my satisfaction regarding access almost all of my initial objections to the scheme still stand, which I have laid out above.