

DEMOLITION OF JOLLY SAILOR PUBLIC HOUSE AND ERECTION OF SHELTERED HOUSING

**STATEMENT OF CASE ON BEHALF OF
JOLLY WELL SAVE IT**

APPEAL REFERENCES :

APP/C4235/A/02/1099953

APP/C4235/A/02/1089957

Introduction

Jolly well save are a group of concerned residents of Marple, who are objecting to the proposed development on a range of grounds. We believe that the proposed development is unsuitable for the site in question and we will be presenting following arguments to support this view.

Appeal Statement of Case on behalf of Jolly well Save It

1. The Character, appearance and land use of the site and surrounding area within the historical context

1.1. A detailed description of the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area will be presented within the historical context of the development site and existing buildings.

1.2. Land use of appeal site in recent years as a local car parking facility.

2. The proposed development

2.1. The proposed development will be described

2.2. Consequences of displacement of car parking from appeal site to surrounding area.

3. Parking provision

3.1. Reference will be made to the local development plan, section UT4.1 Parking Provision in New Developments. We consider that: -

- There will be no facility for on the street parking thus;
- Sufficient off street parking must be provided.

3.2. The local development plan, section UN1.1 Access For People With Access Difficulties. Sheltered housing needs to be designed for people with physical and mobility difficulties. It is unlawful to discriminate against people with disabilities when designing a building. The chronically sick and disabled persons act 1970. Parking spaces provided should reflect the type of people living in the development i.e. old people and people with physical disabilities require wider car parking spaces. There should be parking for visitors, doctors and an ambulance. This is not provided for in this development. The plans do not comply with the specifications for disabled car parking spaces.

4. Provision of affordable housing

4.1. The local development plan, section UH2.3 Provision Of Affordable Housing. Affordable housing should be provided within a development to meet government's guidelines in PPG3. The developer is obliged to provide a nominal amount.

4.2. The particular relevance of this policy to the area in question will be described.

5. Residential amenities

- 5.1 The local development plan, section UH4.1 Infill And Redevelopment In Residential Areas. Developments will be permitted provided they respect the scale, height, style and materials of existing developments. Evidence will be presented to support the case that the building is not in keeping with the character of the local area.
- 5.2. The local development plan, section UH4 Control of Development in Housing Areas. A development must provide reasonable levels of privacy for occupiers and existing properties. The north western proposed building fails to achieve the standards set in policy UH4.7 with respect to 9 and 11 Norbury Avenue.
- 5.3. A 6-meter gap between habitable room windows and the site boundary to the street must be provided as stated in UH4.7 Development Control Standards for New Dwellings.
- 5.4. It will be demonstrated that the proposed development will be likely to lead to an increase in on-street car parking in the locality of the site and thus harm the amenities of residents in the area with respect to their existing parking provision.
- 5.5 The local development plan, section UH2.4 Sheltered Housing and housing for other people with limited mobility. Dwellings must be carefully located to minimise any disadvantages to residents. It will be demonstrated that the location of sheltered

housing on this site is in opposition to the local plan and also to general government guidance in PPG3.

6. Marple district centre

- 6.1 The front portion of the site is located within the boundaries of Marple district centre. We therefore contest the suitability of a residential development within this area.
- 6.2. The local development plan, section US8 Design in Shopping Areas. Developments must respect the historic value of buildings. The shopping experience is not only about buying goods but is also about quality and appearance of the shopping environment. A well-designed and attractive shopping environment is good for business. The Council expresses concern about unsympathetic developments that have little respect for heritage.

7. Access and Safety

- 7.1. The local development plan, section UN1.8 Safety And Security in Developments. Developments must be designed to reduce the likelihood of accidents by providing good visibility for drivers and pedestrians. It will be demonstrated that the visibility splays at the access point are below standards set out in the central government guidance, TD41/95 and “Transport in the Urban Environment” and the councils “The Layout of Roads in Residential Areas”

- 7.1. Safe access should be provided with the intended users in mind. Evidence of cognitive impairment in older people effecting reaction times will illustrate the serious deficiency in the safety of the access arrangements.
- 7.2. The local development plan, section UT1.3 Impact of Development on Traffic Flow and Safety. No turning provision provided for refuse vehicles on site. They will have to reverse down Station Road and into the development on a bend with limited visibility.
- 7.4 The local development plan, section UT1.4 Restraining Congestion on Stockport Road. It will be argued that the development will lead to a material increase in traffic along the A626. Any new developments will exacerbate an existing problem.

8. Lifetime homes verses segregation in the community

- 8.1. The desirability of the proposed development and its benefit to the local community will be called into question.
- 8.2. The housing solution that has been invented to serve the needs of older people in the UK will be presented and evaluated to show that the design embodies a stereotype of aging that is repudiated by many older people.

- 8.3. The concept of lifetime homes is proposed as a more inclusive, less stigmatizing approach.
- 8.4. It will be demonstrated that the within the locality of the site, sheltered housing is already available and that any new development of sheltered housing will undermine a more inclusive approach to housing design in the area at the detriment to the social environment and thus the amenity of the area.

References

- Banister, A., The changing face of Marple, published by the Marple Antiquarian Society
- Buttler, A., Oldham, c, and Greave, J., Sheltered housing for the elderly policy, practice and the consumer, Allen and Unwin, London, 1983.
- Cobboid, C., A cost benefit analysis of Lifetime homes, Joseph Rowntree foundation, York, 1997.
- Swindells, G., B.A. A History of Marple, published by the Marple Antiquarian Society
- Hanson, J., “From Sheltered Housing to Lifetime Homes: An inclusive Approach to Housing”, University City collage London, Bartlett school of graduate studies, January 2001.
- Peace, S., Kellaheer I. and Willocks, D., Re-evaluating long term residential care, Open University Press, Buckingham, 1997.

- Planning Policy Guidance Note 3 “Housing”
- Stockport Unitary Development Plan (Adopted February 1998)