

NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 9 February 2011

UPDATE TO AGENDA

APPLICATION NO.

10/4558M

LOCATION

6 Ashwood Road, Disley

UPDATE PREPARED

7 February 2011

CONSULTATIONS

Disley Parish Council objects on the following grounds:

- Over development of the site.
- Unneighbourly.
- Out of keeping with existing properties.
- Plans misrepresent distance to side boundary.
- Extension will contravene 45° rule and light to both properties will be significantly reduced.
- Contrary to policies BE1 and DC1 of Local Plan

REPRESENTATIONS

At the time of writing, two letters had been received from neighbours at 12 and 14 Ashwood Road objecting to the amended proposal on the following grounds:

- Raised parking area an eyesore.
- Detailed study of site stability required due to scale of rear extension.
- Unneighbourly
- Application form is incorrect as some hedges will have to be removed to allow vehicular access.
- Existing drive too steep to access new parking area, and steeper than shown on plans.
- Risk of accident if vehicle overshoots parking area.
- Extensions out of keeping
- Hazard to integrity of existing sewer.

KEY ISSUES

Revised plans of the existing elevations have been submitted to correct previous inaccuracies, as well as dimensioned elevations and site section in an attempt to better illustrate the relationship of the proposal to existing

ground levels. Measurements that have been checked on site do now correspond with the submitted plans.

The matters raised in the letters of representation were addressed in the original committee report. However, it should be noted that the publicity period for the amended plans expires on 7 February, and therefore additional letters may be received. These will be reported to Members as a verbal update at the Committee meeting.

CONCLUSION

As in the original report, a recommendation of approval is made subject to conditions.

NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 9 FEBRUARY 2011

UPDATE TO AGENDA

APPLICATION NO: 10/4696M

LOCATION 11, Moran Crescent, Macclesfield, SK11 8JJ

UPDATE PREPARED 7 February 2011

KEY ISSUES

It was noted in the original report that the occupant of the neighbouring property, No. 9 Moran Crescent, considered the proposed extension would encroach over the boundary. Clarification had been sought and it was noted that an up-date would be provided. It can be stated that neither the applicant or the occupant of No. 9 have been able to provide information to show that one or other owns the boundary wall outright. It is possible that the boundary wall is jointly owned.

To address the issue, the applicant has revised the plans to ensure that the proposed extension does not encroach (copies of plans attached). The side elevations of the proposed extension have been moved away from the boundary wall a minimum distance of 0.3m and the Agent has stated that, including guttering, there would be an overhang of only 0.2m and foundations will be within the boundary wall.

Hence, based on the information provided and the revised plans submitted, it is considered that encroachment onto the neighbour's land would not occur.

Though not a planning issue, the Agent has shown on the plans that centre-pivot windows are to be installed on the ground-floor side elevation, which will enable them to be cleaned from within the dwelling.

The Agent has also noted that it is the intention of the applicant to remove the existing detached garage, thereby increasing the rear garden space. As a result of this it is recommended an additional condition be attached, should the application be approved, requiring details of replacement boundary treatment to be submitted.

Members visited the site on 3rd Feb, during which it was confirmed that the obscure-glazed window on the ground-floor of No. 9 closest to the front of the property, serves a separate utility room. (It was noted in the original report that the window was a secondary window to the dining room with a utility area adjacent).

CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION

As the issue of encroachment has been addressed, it is considered that the revised plans are acceptable and it is recommended the application be approved, subject to conditions set out in the committee report and the additional condition below.

1. Details of boundary treatment to be submitted to and approved by the LPA prior to the demolition of the garage. The approved details are to be implemented prior to the occupancy of the extension.

NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 9th February 2011

UPDATE TO AGENDA

APPLICATION NO: 10/4353M

LOCATION: ONE OAK, ONE OAK LANE, WILMSLOW

UPDATE PREPARED: 7th February 2011

OTHER REPRESENTATIONS

An additional 3 letters of objection have been received that raise similar points to those already submitted but are summarised as follows:

- Object to the demolition of the existing dwellinghouse due to its historical association and good example of a Lutchens inspired Arts & Crafts style;
- The Local Plan seeks to protect heritage assets;
- The proposed extensions maintain the building's character, the replacement dwelling does not;
- The replacement dwelling would be materially larger than the original building;
- A number of criticisms are made of the submitted Design & Access Statement and a number of inaccuracies are outlined;
- They note that the original dwellinghouse has been extended; that these extensions have not been taken into consideration; and reference is made to the policies contained within PPG2 in respect of extensions to dwellings in the Green Belt. (This is not applicable as the application relates to a replacement dwelling, not extensions);
- It does not comply with the one of the five purposes of including land in the Green Belt in that it would not preserve the setting and special character of historic towns;
- Concern with how materials, construction vehicles etc will access the site given the narrowness of the road;
- One letter asks that should permission be granted that conditions are placed on the application to prevent any alterations to the existing boundaries, that permitted development rights are removed; and that a management condition is attached in respect of contractor's vehicles etc.

A further comment in respect of a covenant is not a material planning consideration.

CONCLUSION

All of the above points have already been taken into consideration in the original report to committee. The recommendation remains as set out in the committee report: Approve subject to conditions.

