Public Document Pack



Northern Planning Committee Further Update

Date:Wednesday, 3rd November, 2021Time:10.00 amVenue:The Capesthorne Room - Town Hall, Macclesfield SK10 1EA

The information on the following pages was received following publication of the Committee agenda.

7. Further Planning Update (Pages 3 - 4)

This page is intentionally left blank

Page 3

NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 3rd November 2021

UPDATE TO AGENDA

APPLICATION NO. 21/4426M

LOCATION

Car Park, John Street, Macclesfield, SK11 8BN

UPDATE PREPARED

02 November 2021

KEY ISSUES

This further update report has been prepared to address an omission from the original report.

Page 6 of the agenda lists two reasons for refusal of the previous application (20/1063M), however this previous application was refused for three reasons. Two are correctly identified in the original report, however the third reason was missing. For the avoidance of doubt, the third reason for refusal was:

"3. The proposed development will be unduly dominant upon the outlook from the rear elevations of the properties on High St, and their relatively small outdoor amenity spaces, which would be very overbearing. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies DC3 and DC38 of the MBLP and the CEC Design Guide"

In terms of the relationships between dwellings within the application site and the properties on the opposite side of John Street, there is approximately 10.3m from the front of the proposed dwellings to the front of those opposite, which is a distance that is commensurate with the local area but is clearly well below the standards set out in the local plan. The properties that border the eastern boundary of the site on High Street have a variety of rear projections facing the application site. The nearest of these is at number 39 (on the corner of John St & High St), which is located almost 7m from the blank side gable of the new properties. The neighbour at 41 High Street has habitable room windows facing towards the site at a distance of 8m. The eastern gable of the application properties is positioned 3.3m from the shared boundary with these properties along High Street. The application properties are also set at a higher level than the dwellings on High Street.

As noted above the previous application was refused due to the impact upon these properties on High Street, and whilst the height of the previous scheme was greater (approximately 8.5m high compared to the 8m now proposed), the positioning of the dwellings is now much closer to the neighbours on High Street (7m compared to the 9m previously refused). The proximity and bulk of the buildings now proposed is considered to be more harmful than the scheme that was previously refused. The buildings will be very dominant features and overbearing in terms of the outlook from the rear elevations of the properties on High St, and their relatively small outdoor amenity spaces.

Accordingly, whilst reductions in the separation guidelines within the Design Guide and policy DC38 of the MBLP could be accepted given the character of the local area, the position, height and bulk of the proposed development would be harmfully overbearing to the occupiers of neighbouring properties, contrary to policies DC3 and DC38 of the MBLP.

CONCLUSION

Therefore, having considered this matter in further detail, and contrary to the recommendation in the original report, the application is now recommended for refusal for the following reason:

1. The proposed development will be unduly dominant and overbearing in terms of the outlook from the rear elevations of the properties on High St, and their relatively small outdoor amenity spaces. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies DC3 and DC38 of the MBLP and the CEC Design Guide.