



McCARTHY STONE

Life, well lived

Proposed Retirement Development – Oakfield, Sale

Summary Appeal Statement

Proof: Ken Earl BA(Hons)DIP ARCH RIBA

Appeal Reference: APP/CE4245/W/23/3325034

1.0 Introduction

The statement is prepared by Ken Earl BA (Hons) Dip Arch RIBA, I am a qualified architect, my experience is contained within my main statement (page 5)

The statement summary is prepared in support of an appeal by McCarthy & Stone against their refusal by Trafford Council of application no. 109745/FUL/22.

2.0 Reasons for Refusal

My main statement addresses reasons 2, 3, 4 & 5 (see page 7)

3.0 Planning Application History

See main appeal statement (page 9)

4.0 Client Brief

See main appeal statement (page 11)

5.0 The Site

5.1 The Site Location

- The site is located Southwest of Manchester, in Sale on Oakfield.

- The site is set within a primarily residential character area.
- Within very close proximity there are commercial, retail and leisure buildings.

See main statement page 13.

5.2 The Site

- The site is L shaped in form and is 0.56 Acres /0.23 Hectares in area.
- Is flat with 2 access point onto Oakfield
- Is currently in residential use
- Is primarily surrounded by dwellings and a school.

See main statement page 14.

5.3 Context, Character, Constraints & Opportunities

- There is a varied mix of residential character buildings in close proximity.
- The overwhelming character of Oakfield is one of substantial dwellings sat behind a treelined Street with brick boundary walls prevailing.

See main statement pages 15-19.

6.0 Application

6.1 Initial Proposal

The initial design proposals incorporated the following key design principles:

- Mass appropriate to the site, context & character of the area.
- Pitched roof form appropriate to the character of the context.
- Create a safe access whilst maintaining the tree frontage to Oakfield.
- Provide appropriate stand-off distances to adjacent properties.

6.2 Design Development

See main statement pages 23.

6.3 Development Principles

See main statement page 24.

6.4 Layout

- Set behind the building line of Michael Court and behind the retained tree lined frontage.
- Communal facilities located to the building frontage.
- Each apartment has a private balcony or garden terraces, the lounge opens onto a south facing terrace.

- Northern gardens provide a buffer to Michael Court.
- Southern garden provides a buffer to the school building.

See main statement page 25.

6.5 Use and Amount

- Retirement living apartments, offering independent living within a safe and secure environment.
- A communal homeowners lounge, reception, guest suite, mobility scooter store, refuse store and communal gardens are provided.
- 25 retirement living apartments including:
 - 14 1 Beds
 - 11 2 Beds
- 16 carparking spaces.

See main statement page 26.

6.6 Scale

Designed to relate to the height of the direct context, the building form includes a primary mass to the site frontage with a diminishing mass to the rear of the site.

See main statement pages 27-31.

6.7 Appearance

The building has been designed as a contemporary interpretation of the local character:

- Materials- red brick & render
- Simple brick detailing with feature stone detailing
- Pitched tiled roof with steep gables.
- Large, vertically proportioned, diminishing in height windows.
- Brick frontage boundary wall with hedge planting.

See main statement pages 32-34.

6.8 Accessibility

Designed to provide level access, externally and internally and to meet the requirements of building regulation part M.

See main statement pages 35.

7.0 Detailed Analysis & Response to Reason for Refusal

7.1 Reason for refusal 2:

Relates to “its incoherent appearance, form, siting, height and layout.”

My Statement addresses the above as follows:

7.1.2. Appearance

The main Statement includes a detailed elevational Design Analysis which illustrates clearly that the design relates to the context (page 37 & 38)

7.1.3. Materials and detailing

The main statement provides images and analysis to identify that the proposed materials and detailing of the red brick, render, stone and glazed feature balconies are appropriate in the context (pages 39-43)

7.1.4. Form, Siting and Footprint

The main statement (pages 44-46) provides images and analysis to confirm the following:

- Appropriate streetscape, building frontage widths and urban grain.
- Appropriate distances to adjacent boundaries and buildings.
- Building siting creates positive external spaces.

7.1.5 Height & Scale

The main statement (pages 47-50) provides images and analysis to confirm the following:

- Proposed ridge heights are appropriate to the direct context.
- Proposed eaves heights are important to the perceived mass of the building which relate favourably to the direct context.

7.1.6. Reason for refusal 2: Conclusion

The main statement (page 51) concludes refusal 2 is unfounded.

7.2 Reason for refusal 3:

Reason 3 relates to :

- Proposed new vehicular access and car parking
- Removal of trees and landscaping and effect on character of the area
- Inappropriate boundary treatments

To address the reason for refusal the main statement contains 3 clear areas for analysis:

- Highway safety

- Character of the Streetscene
- Accessibility.

7.2.1. Highway Safety

A new vehicular access has been proposed on the grounds of safety, the main statement confirms that:

- The existing access to the south is located on a bend, opposite the junction of Hunters mews and with limited visibility and is not safe and should not be utilised.
- The access to the North is limited in width and is position close to the northern boundary does not afford the possibility of creating an appropriate turning area for both refuse and fire appliances.

See main statement pages 52-54

7.2.2. Character of the Streetscene

To provide a safe access whilst retaining the streetscene character, the proposals include for :

- Infilling the existing access points with dwarf brick walls with stone copings and hedge planting to fully match the existing boundary treatment.
- The new access is defined with brick pillars with stone copings.
- Minimise tree / vegetation removal and providing new tree planting.

See main statement page 55

7.2.3. Accessibility

The carpark has been designed to provide an appropriate surface, clearly defined disabled parking with appropriate drop kerbs to ensure the carpark is accessible and inclusive.

See main statement page 56.

7.2.4 Reason for refusal 3: Conclusion

The main statement page 56 concludes refusal 3 is unfounded.

7.3 Reason for refusal 4:

Reason 4 states that the proposed development fails to provide appropriate quantity and quality of external amenity space.

7.3.1 Quantity of Amenity Space

The main statement illustrates that:

- The appeal scheme provides 29.61m² per apartment of usable external amenity space.

- Trafford Borough Council SPG1: New Residential Development section 13.5 requires 18sq.m per apartment.

It is clear therefore that an appropriate quantity of external amenity space is provided and the reason for refusal is unfounded. See main Statement pages 58-60.

7.3.2. Quality of Amenity Space

The main statement (pages 61-63) demonstrates that the appeal scheme provides high quality external amenity spaces which includes:

- Private spaces (balconies and terraces)
- Communal spaces
- Large terrace (for group gatherings and events)
- Pergola
- Gazebo
- Raised planting beds
- Bench seating
- Ornamental planting
- New tree planting
- Pathways
- Areas of shade

7.3.3. Reason for refusal 4: Conclusion

The main statement page 63 concludes refusal 4 is unfounded.

7.4 Reason for refusal 5:

Reason 5 relates to the relationship with adjacent property 41 Ashland, specifically in relation to scale, height and massing and undue overlooking.

The main summary addresses the following factors:

7.4.1. Overshadowing

The shadow study contained within the main statement (pages 64 & 65) identifies no overshadowing of the rear garden to no 41 Ashlands and as such does not cause any detriment to the daylight / sunlight received within the rear garden.

7.4.2. Overlooking

The main statement (pages 66-67) identifies the following:

- The proposal has no windows adjacent to the boundary of 41 Ashlands.
- Trafford Council Statement of Case agrees balconies close to the boundary can be provided with a suitable privacy screen.
- It also confirms that any future occupant would have to lean out around the screen to gain any view of the garden of 41 Ashlands.

The main statement concludes this scenario cannot be considered as a reasonable definition of potential overlooking.

7.4.3. Boundary Condition

The main statement (page 68) illustrates that the shared boundary to 41 Ashlands has:

- A 2m high close boarded fence
- 5 no substantial trees between 5 & 9 m high.

The council documentation recognises that the boundary trees offer an element of screening between the sites.

7.4.4. Building heights and distances

The main statement (pages 69-70) includes detailed building heights and relevant distances to boundaries and buildings.

- The elevational diagrams illustrate a continuation of the roof ridge step line corresponding with the ridge height of 41 Ashland.
- The distance from the gable of the appeal scheme to the single storey conservatory is 12.5m which is in excess of recognised guidance (12m)

7.4.5 Reason for Refusal 5: Conclusion

The main statement (page 71) concludes refusal 5 is unfounded.

8.0 Conclusion

It is my professional opinion that given the weight of evidence above, the design submitted is appropriate to the site context & character, constraints and setting in relation to Scale, Form, Mass, Layout and Appearance and provides good quality and a generous quantity of external amenity areas appropriate for the intended building occupants.

The architectural reasons for refusal are therefore not justified.