[redacted]

Chorlton Cum Hardy

Manchester

M21 9LR

Mr Dave Morris

Further to the revised scheme with reference 127013/FH/2020, We would like to raise further objections in respect of this application.

We are not in general opposed to the erection of extensions to dwellings within the conservation zone of Chorltonville, however the current application we feel is inappropriate for the area.

1. The application title is misleading, and reads – *"Erection of a two storey **outbuilding** following demolition of existing outbuilding"* Having looked at the application plans we feel this should be revised to *"Erection of two storey **dwelling** following the demolition of the existing outbuilding"* – It is clear that the revised application is for a stand alone dwelling with a separate access point to the main dwelling.

2. The revision to this application relies heavily on the retrospective planning ref 123830/LE/2019 gained on the existing outbuilding. The retrospective planning gained on this structure was for use as an outbuilding and not living accommodation, let alone a stand alone dwelling.

3. The new plans and elevations submitted, drawing ref 420/10, 420/11 and 420/12 all show an incorrect boundary position. I have enclosed mark ups of the correct boundary line on the submitted plans which follows a straight line through roughly the centre of the driveway between No. 68 and No. 70. I have also attached land registry extracts for the two properties.

4. We feel that the erecting of a new stand alone dwelling in this location within a conservation zone inappropriate.

5. It is not clear from the application as to the proposed end use of this new dwelling, it should be noted that no commercial use should be allowed in the conservation setting including rental of rooms under short term lease as this will be a detriment to the conservation zone.

6. The Heritage statement is misleading, it states; "the existing outbuilding is not visible from the street given the screening" – this is not the case, the existing building is visible from the street, and the proposed new dwelling will remain visible from the street.

7. Comparing the existing plans and elevations drawing no. 420/1.03.020 which shows the existing structure sitting away from the boundary line on the west elevation. The proposed drawings for this new dwelling show that some parts of the proposed new dwelling will sit over the boundary line, namely the gutter on the West elevation as the new cavity wall sits closer than the existing wall.

In summary; the proposed development should not rely upon the retrospective planning gained under application 123830/LE/2019 since the plan is to demolish this structure and to construct a new stand alone dwelling. The retrospective planning gained was not for living accommodation or a stand alone residential unit. We feel that a new dwelling in this location inappropriate in the conservation setting and does not have appropriate access or egress.

The documents are misleading in that the boundary position is overstated to create the idea that the dwelling would have access across land which is not within the ownership of no. 68.

Instead we feel that if the existing structure is to be demolished, then an extension more appropriate to and in fitting with the conservation zone should be proposed. Any new extension for living accommodation should be attached to the existing dwelling.

Any submitted plans for such an extension should comply with current planning rules including extending out from the rear, not to contravene the 45 dgeree rule for rights of light to neighbouring properties.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kind Regards

[redacted]

[redacted]