

ITEM

Application Reference	DC/070732
Location:	394 Chester Road Woodford Stockport SK7 1QG
PROPOSAL:	Erection of a 2 storey detached dwelling.
Type Of Application:	Full Application
Registration Date:	29.08.2018
Expiry Date:	20181024
Case Officer:	Jane Chase
Applicant:	Mr Roger Burton
Agent:	

DELEGATION/COMMITTEE STATUS

If Members are minded to agree the recommendation then the application should be referred to the Planning & Highways Committee as the grant of planning permission would be contrary to the Development Plan.

DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

The application proposes the erection of a 2 storey detached house in the side garden of 394 Chester Road. The house would be positioned forward of 394 Chester Road by 4.8m and forward of 392 Chester Road by 1m.

The proposed house would be of a contemporary design; to the front, 2 floors of accommodation are proposed with a pitched roof above. To the rear, the pitched roof drops down to the ground floor with the first floor accommodation breaking through the roof with a flat roof above. Below this projecting first floor accommodation the roof slopes down and overhangs the ground floor elevation in the form of a canopy. The house would be constructed from timber cladding with a shingle roof, a zinc clad 'eyebrow' over the projecting first floor accommodation to the rear and zinc cladding framing the library window in the front elevation.

The house would be positioned 5m forward of 394 Chester Road, 1.5m off the boundary and 3m off the side elevation of 394 Chester Road. In relation to 392 Chester Road, the proposed house would be sited at an angle to that house, 3m forward of the garage, 1.3m to 2m off the boundary and 2.8m to 3.6m off the side elevation.

A new vehicle access onto Chester Road is proposed with off street in the front garden. To the front boundary it is proposed to remove the existing fence to the west of the proposed access and reposition it up to 0.8m further back into the site. The relocation of this section of the fence together with the creation of the new access will result in the loss of 4 trees (3 cherry trees, 1 laburnum and 1 apple). The existing access to 394 Chester Road would be retained to serve that dwelling. A detached garage will be retained within the garden of the proposed house although no vehicle access to it will remain or be proposed.

The house would be built to Passivhaus standards being highly insulated, increased air tightness and low energy demands. Heating and hot water will be provided via a ground source heatpump drawing its energy from below the house and electricity will be sourced from photovoltaic panels positioned on the front roof plane.

The application is accompanied by a Design & Access Statement, a Transport Assessment, an Energy Statement and a Green Belt justification.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application site comprises the side garden of a 2 storey detached house predominantly laid to lawn adjacent to the roundabout junction of Chester Road (A5149) and Woodford Road (A5102). The site is enclosed by a mature hedge and fence to Woodford Road and Chester Road. To the east of the site is 392 Chester Road, a detached 2 storey house with a single storey extension accommodating a garage adjacent to the boundary with the application site. There is an existing boundary hedge which separates the site from the adjoining property at 392 Chester Road and fencing separation to 221 Woodford Road. There is a mature oak tree located within the highway (on back edge of the footway), north east of the site and fronting 392 Chester Road.

POLICY BACKGROUND

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 ("PCPA 2004") requires that planning applications be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The Development Plan includes-

- Policies set out in the Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review adopted 31st May 2006 which have been saved by direction under paragraph 1(3) of Schedule 8 to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004; &
- Policies set out in the Stockport Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document adopted 17th March 2011.

Saved policies of the SUDP Review

LCR1.1 Landscape Character Areas
GBA1.2 Control of Development in Green Belt
GBA1.5 Residential Development in the Green Belt
L1.2 Children's Play

LDF Core Strategy/Development Management policies

SD-3 Delivering the Energy Opportunities Plans – New Development
CS2 Housing Provision
CS4 Distribution of Housing
H-1 Design of Residential Development
H-2 Housing Phasing
CS8 Safeguarding & Improving the Environment
SIE-1 Quality Places
SIE-2 Provision of Recreation and Amenity Open Space in New Developments

SIE-3 Protecting, Safeguarding & Enhancing the Environment
CS9 Transport & Development
T-1 Transport & Development
T-2 Parking in Developments
T-3 Safety & Capacity on the Highway Network

Supplementary Planning Guidance

Supplementary Planning Guidance does not form part of the Statutory Development Plan; nevertheless it does provide non-statutory Council approved guidance that is a material consideration when determining planning applications.

Design of Residential Development
Transport & Planning in Residential Areas

National Planning Policy Framework

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) initially published on 27th March 2012, subsequently revised and published on 24th July 2018 by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government sets out the government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. The revised National Planning Policy Framework will be a vital tool in ensuring that we get planning for the right homes built in the right places of the right quality at the same time as protecting our environment.

N.B. In respect of decision-taking the revised NPPF constitutes a "material consideration".

Para.1 *"The National Planning Policy Framework sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these should be applied".*

Para.2 *"Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise".*

Para.7 *"The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development".*

Para.8 *"Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways (so that opportunities can be taken to secure net gains across each of the different objectives):*

- a) an economic objective*
- b) a social objective*
- c) an environmental objective"*

Para.11 *"Plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development.*

For decision-taking this means:

- c) approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or*

d) where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless:

i. the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or

ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole”.

Para.12 “.....Where a planning application conflicts with an up-to-date development plan (including any neighbourhood plans that form part of the development plan), permission should not usually be granted. Local planning authorities may take decisions that depart from an up-to-date development plan, but only if material considerations in a particular case indicate that the plan should not be followed”.

Para.38 “Local planning authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way..... Decision-makers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible”.

Para.47 “Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Decisions on applications should be made as quickly as possible, and within statutory timescales unless a longer period has been agreed by the applicant in writing”.

Para.124 “The creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities”.

Para.130 “Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, taking into account any local design standards or style guides in plans or supplementary planning documents. Conversely, where the design of a development accords with clear expectations in plan policies, design should not be used by the decision-maker as a valid reason to object to development”.

Para.133 “The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence”.

Para.134 “Green Belt serves five purposes:

- to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- to assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land”.

Para.141 *“Once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land”.*

Para.143 *“Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances”.*

Para.144 *“When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. “Very special circumstances” will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations”.*

Para.145 *“A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this arelimited infilling in villages.*

Para.153 states *“In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should expect new development to:*

a) comply with any development plan policies on local requirements for decentralised energy supply unless it can be demonstrated by the applicant, having regard to the type of development involved and its design, that this is not feasible or viable; and

b) take account of landform, layout, building orientation, massing and landscaping to minimise energy consumption”.

Para.213 *“existing policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to the publication of this Framework. Due weight should be given to them, according to their degree of consistency with this Framework (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given)”.*

Planning Practice Guidance

The Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) is a web-based resource which brings together planning guidance on various topics into one place (launched in March 2014) and coincided with the cancelling of the majority of Government Circulars which had previously given guidance on many aspects of planning.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

J/61030; Type: XHS; Address: Land Adjacent to 394 Chester Road Woodford; Proposal: Erection of detached dwelling and construction of vehicular access on to Chester Road (outline); Decision Date: 06-APR-95; Decision: REF on highway grounds and dismissed at appeal on 18th October 1995.

J/65721; Type: XHS; Address: Land Adjacent to 394 Chester Road Woodford; Proposal: Erection of detached dwelling and construction of vehicular access to Chester Road (outline); Decision Date: 26-NOV-96; Decision: REF on highway grounds and dismissed at appeal on 16th April 1997.

DC/001854; Type: OUT; Address: Land Adjacent to 394 Chester Road, Woodford, Stockport, Cheshire, SK7 1QG; Proposal: New single dwelling & detached garage;

Decision Date: 24-OCT-00; Decision: REF was refused on grounds of highway safety and dismissed at appeal on 17 August 2001.

DC/060973; Type: FUL; Address: Land Adjacent to 394 Chester Road, Woodford, Stockport, SK7 1QG; Proposal: Erection of 2 storey detached dwelling in side garden; Decision Date: 08-APR-16; Decision: REF on grounds of highway safety and dismissed at appeal on 2nd September 2016.

NEIGHBOUR'S VIEWS

The application has been advertised by way of a site and press notice as a departure to the Development Plan. The occupiers of 3 neighbouring properties have also been notified of the receipt of the application. To date no comments have been received.

CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Highway Engineer- The application is for the construction of a dwelling in garden land with a dropped crossing access provided on Chester Road. The site has an extensive planning history with numerous applications and appeals over many years pertaining to similar proposals for a single dwelling with access from Chester Road. Applications in the past have consistently been opposed, refused and upheld on appeal on the grounds that an acceptable means of access was not proposed and the consequent risk to highway operation and safety that would arise from its use.

This application is very similar to previous proposals albeit the applicant has sought to react positively to refusal reasons and appeal decisions, by acknowledging the need for and proposing realignment of boundary fencing to maximise visibility to and for emerging drivers.

There has also been a material change in circumstances since the consideration of previous applications for this site with the A6MARR opening recently and consequently traffic volume and composition has significantly changed and reduced along Chester Road fronting the plot. I add however, whilst traffic flow has significantly reduced, Chester Road remains a classified road and part of the strategic network with visibility requirements remaining unchanged for any access onto such a part of the network.

I should at this stage point out some misleading elements in the supporting Transport Statement which was written in July/August 18. There is emphasis on the suitability of the proposed access being predicated on the A6MARR having partially opened at the time of writing and that the traffic flow past the application site has reduced. At the time this was not actually correct, no new sections of the A6MARR had opened to traffic and the existing A555 section from Woodford Road to Wilmslow Road, whilst open, had been open since the 1990's. The road in entirety opened to traffic in October 2018 and as such established traffic patterns have only recently started to change.

Notwithstanding this, I must be minded when considering this proposal that the A6MARR is now open to all traffic and that there has been a clear and evidential reduction in traffic volume and the composition of vehicles passing the site frontage to Chester Road. The fact that there is less traffic along this section of Chester Road is clearly of benefit to the area and has some positive merit in terms of this application.

As I commented earlier, the site has an extensive planning history and there is available radar speed readings that were undertaken in March 2015. The readings gives the 85th percentile speed of vehicles approaching the roundabout adjacent to the site frontage from the West and the speed of vehicles emerging from the roundabout onto Chester Road, travelling east. A further set of speed readings have been undertaken in June 2018 and these show that the actual speed of vehicles negotiating and leaving and approaching the roundabout has not materially changed in the last 3 years. Although I note the second set of readings was prior to traffic flows on Chester Road being influenced by the A6MARR opening I feel it is reasonable to acknowledge that the geometric layout of the roundabout and the sightlines and characteristics of the approaches are the factors that restrain vehicle speeds to those identified. My view has also to be informed by works that are currently being undertaken to improve the roundabout with a new circulatory island and better pedestrian crossing facilities being constructed and this work is not likely to give rise to any increase in vehicle speeds through the junction. If anything, vehicle speeds could be seen to reduce slightly so even with the lesser flows through the junction that are occurring, I do not feel I can argue or evidence that the vehicle speeds approaching or negotiating the roundabout will be likely to change for the worse at any time in the near future.

On this basis I see no reason not to be accepting of the 85th percentile speeds that have been identified. These are 29.2 mph wet weather for vehicles travelling west on Chester Road towards the site access/roundabout and 19.3 mph wet weather for vehicles travelling eastbound from the roundabout towards the site access.

When actual vehicle speeds are known it can be acceptable practice to provide visibility relative to speed and travel distance rather than the speed limit or design speed of a road. There is a reasonable presumption that following the opening of the A6MARR, the proportion of HGV's travelling along Chester Road has reduced and this provides some flexibility in determining sightlines. Whilst I have no survey data to demonstrate such I am satisfied from previous survey data and predicted data from the A6MARR scheme, that the combined proportion of HGV's and Buses should now be less than 5% of the volume of traffic travelling across the site frontage. Acknowledging this, the commensurate stopping sight distances and visibility requirements are a 41m sightline to the East (Poynton direction) and 24m to the West (towards roundabout), measured from a setback of 2.4m.

The previous application which was refused and dismissed at appeal proposed sightlines measuring 2m by 34m (or 50m to the centreline) in an easterly direction and 2m by 23m westward. The Planning Inspectorate agreed with the Council in accepting the sightline to the east but not accepting of the sightline to the west, commenting that a sightline of 23m or even 29m as was later suggested was achievable, would not be adequate and that the proposed means of access would not be safe.

This application proposes a 2.4m by 41m sightline measured to the carriageway centreline in an easterly direction. I acknowledge that I have previously accepted a measurement could be taken to the centreline in this direction due to the presence of features that discourage overtaking and kerbside parking and this should see all vehicles remaining in the westbound traffic lane and not crossing the centreline. That being the case a 41m distance is acceptable and I raise no issue. I also welcome that visibility will be measured for a distance 2.4m back from the kerb, as I have always required and a view endorsed by the Planning Inspectorate as being entirely appropriate for this site.

Towards the roundabout, the applicant is now proposing to realign boundary fencing and remove some landscaping and this enables a sightline measuring 2.4m by 35m to be provided. The 35m measurement is proposed by the applicant to be taken to a point within the circulatory carriageway, offset 1m from the kerbline. The supporting document infers that the vast majority of vehicles actually track a line which is at least 1m from the kerbline when negotiating the roundabout junction and that design standards do permit a sightline to be measured to a point offset from the kerbline. I have to concur with this view having observed for myself the track of vehicles negotiating the roundabout and noting design requirements which do allow measurement to a point offset from the kerbline. In this case I have no reason or justification not to accept a 1m offset for visibility purposes and I note that the splay line measured to the kerbline does actually afford 32.5m which is a significant improvement over the measurement considered in this direction in the past.

I note that a sightline of 35m would provide visibility up to an 85th percentile wet weather speed of 26 mph and this is a variation in speed of about 7 mph more than the actual recorded speeds. I feel this provides a degree of comfort and I do not now consider there is any reasonable case that could be argued against the proposal. I consider the applicant has been positive in acknowledging that fencing and boundary treatment will be affected and will have to change to ensure that adequate visibility is afforded and an access design that is more reflective of vehicle speeds and the geometric nature of the adjoining highway has been proposed.

In summary, I feel that the submission has responded positively to previous refusal and appeal dismissals in addressing the determinant issues. There has also been significant changes in traffic volume across the site frontage as a consequence of the recent opening of the A6MARR and I now consider that it would be difficult and unreasonable to oppose the creation of an access to serve a dwelling on this site.

Within the site, I am satisfied that sufficient space can be laid out for vehicle parking and manoeuvring with the details being a matter for conditional control. Further conditions will be required to cover access formation, visibility splay retention, no gates across the vehicle access, cycle parking and construction management.

Recommendation: No objections.

ANALYSIS

The application site has been the subject of many applications seeking planning permission for the erection of a new dwelling. These applications have all been refused planning permission and dismissed at appeal on grounds of highway safety. The main issue in this respect has always been the failure of the proposed development to secure adequate sightlines from the proposed access and the consequent risk to highway operation and safety that would arise from its use.

Principle of Development

Policy CS4 directs new housing towards 3 spatial priority areas (the town centre, district and large local centres, and finally, other accessible locations). Policy H2 (Housing Phasing) of the Core Strategy states that the delivery and supply of new housing will be monitored and managed to ensure that provision is in line with the local trajectory, the local previously developed land target is being applied and a continuous 5 year deliverable supply of housing is maintained. Stockport is currently in a position of housing undersupply against the minimum requirement of 5 years +5% as set out in para 47 of the NPPF. In such situations of undersupply, policy CS4 allows policy H-2 to come into effect bringing housing

development on sites which meet the Council's reduced accessibility criteria. Having regard to the continued under supply of housing within the Borough, the accessibility score has been reduced to zero.

For the purposes of the above policy position, the application site is in an accessible location and as such the principle of additional residential accommodation remains compliant with Core Strategy policies CS4 and H2.

Core Strategy policies H-3 and SIE-2 require the provision of affordable housing and open space commuted sum payments on applications for residential development. Further to the revision of the National Planning Policy Guidance following the judgement in relation to SoS vs Reading & W.Berkshire, however, this Authority is no longer able to seek affordable housing or tariff style payments in relation of open space provision on developments of 10 or less dwellings. As such, the application need make no provision in this respect.

Policy SD-3 requires an assessment of how the proposed development can contribute to becoming carbon neutral through the use of micro regeneration technologies in order to reduce CO2 emissions. Given that the development proposes less than 10 dwellings there is no policy requirement, however, to incorporate any of these technologies. The application however proposes a dwelling constructed to Passivhaus standards being highly insulated, increased air tightness and low energy demands. Heating and hot water will be provided via a ground source heatpump drawing it energy from below the house and electricity will be sourced from photovoltaic panels positioned on the front roof plane. On this basis, the proposal complies with policy SD-3.

In Green Belt terms, the relevant Development Plan policies are contained within the UDP Review and the NPPF. Planning law requires that planning applications are determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The NPPF is a material consideration in planning decisions.

Policy GBA1.2 confirms that there is a presumption against the construction of new buildings unless it is for one of 4 purposes (agriculture/forestry; outdoor sport/recreation; extension/alteration/replacement of existing dwellings and limited infilling/redevelopment of Major Existing Developed Sites). Policy GBA1.5 states that residential development in the Green Belt will be restricted to agricultural dwellings, re-use of buildings and limited infilling/redevelopment of Major Existing Developed Sites. The proposed development does not fall within any of those exceptions and therefore for the purposes of policies GBA1.2 and GBA1.5 must be considered inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

The revised NPPF was published in 2018, post dates the UDP Review and sets out the Governments most up to date policy position in relation to development in the Green Belt. The NPPF confirms that inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved other than in 'very special circumstances' (para 143). Paragraph 145 confirms that the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt; exceptions to this include (amongst other matters) limited infilling in villages.

It has been accepted through many applications and appeals that Woodford is a village and the application site is clearly visually and functionally linked with that village. The site is bounded to either side by 2 storey detached dwellings and to the rear by the rear garden of a house on Woodford Road. The development is clearly limited being for 1 dwelling only and of a size and scale in keeping with

that existing in the locality. On this basis, and noting that none of the earlier refusals of planning permission were based on the development being contrary to Green Belt policy, it is considered that the proposal constitutes limited infilling in a village and therefore accords with para 145 of the NPPF.

Impact on the character of the locality and residential amenity

The character of the locality is derived from detached 2 storey houses sited within spacious landscaped plots. The proposed development would reduce the garden to 394 Chester Road however in excess of 140m² of amenity space would remain to serve that dwelling. This amenity space whilst being to the front of the dwelling would remain private due to the screening afforded by the landscaping along the boundary to Woodford Road and Chester Road. The level of amenity space retained exceeds the 100m² required by the SPD 'Design of Residential Development' and therefore will remain in keeping with the established character of the area. That proposed to serve the new dwelling equates to 125m² at the rear of the house with additional space to the front (that being private for the same reasons as previously stated in relation to the retained garden for the existing dwelling). Again this reflects the spacious character of the locality and complies with the requirements of the SPD.

In respect of design, Core Strategy policy SIE-1 confirms that development that is designed to the highest contemporary standard paying high regard to the built environment within which it is sited will be given positive consideration. Specific regard should be paid to use of materials appropriate to the location and the sites characteristics and context in relation to surrounding buildings.

The Council's SPD Design of Residential Development advises that 'design should reflect the locality, but be honest to the current time and techniques of building design and construction.....contemporary designs may be used, where appropriate....the scheme should be of an extremely high standard and designed from a strong understanding of the surrounding context....in areas with little or no character, the Council particularly welcomes innovative contemporary designs that create or improve the character of the site and surrounding area.'

The NPPF advises that planning decisions should ensure that developments add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and layout, and are sympathetic to the local character while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change.

As such, a contemporary approach to the redevelopment of this site is wholly acceptable. It should also be noted that none of the previous refusals related to the size, siting or design of the proposed dwelling and that proposed is the same as that previously considered.

The proposed development makes reference to the existing character of the locality through the contemporary interpretation of design elements, size and scale. Whilst there is little evidence of timber clad houses locally the proposed dwelling will not be unduly prominent in public views being positioned 14m to 20m from the site frontage on Chester Road behind a 1.8m high fence and maturely landscaped front garden. The character of the locality is derived from a mix of architectural styles and that proposed will reflect that varied character.

The siting of the dwelling is staggered between that of 392 and 394 Chester Road in a similar position as has previously been proposed. It is not considered that the limited projection forward of 392 Chester Road will result in a loss of amenity to the occupiers of that property given the siting of the dwelling off the

boundary, the separation between the dwelling and 392 Chester Road and the screening afforded by the landscaping on the boundary. Equally, the siting of the proposed dwelling forward of 394 Chester Road is considered acceptable for the same reasons.

The proposed development will result in the loss of 4 trees. None of these are legally protected nor considered worthy of protection and could be removed at any time. There is much landscaping within the application site and the removal of these trees may actually improve conditions for that retained. On this basis the proposed development is considered acceptable.

Impact on highway safety

It is noted that all the previous applications seeking planning permission for the erection of a new dwelling were refused and dismissed on grounds of highway safety. Noting that the size, siting and design of the proposed dwelling is the same as that previously considered, highway safety remains the determinant issue in the consideration of this application.

The extensive comments of the Highway Engineer are reported in detail above and it is not intended to repeat that advice. Members are advised that this application differs from those previously considered in that the realignment of boundary fencing to maximise visibility to and for emerging drivers is now proposed. Crucially there has also been a material change in circumstance since the consideration of the earlier applications and appeals that being the opening of the A6MARR. Consequently traffic volume and composition has significantly changed and reduced along Chester Road fronting the plot.

Having regard to the detailed comments and analysis of the Highway Engineer, it is concluded that the amendments to the access proposed by this application together with the material change in conditions on the adjacent highway weigh in favour of this application. Subject to the imposition of conditions as requested by the Highway Engineer, it is considered that the development is acceptable in this respect and complies with Core Strategy policies CS9 Transport & Development, T-1 Transport & Development, T-2 Parking in Developments and T-3 Safety & Capacity on the Highway Network.

RECOMMENDATION Grant subject to conditions

BRAMHALL AND CHEADLE HULME SOUTH AREA COMMITTEE 13TH DECEMBER 2018

The Planning Officer introduced the application advising Members that since the report had been written, a letter had been received from United Utilities confirming that they have no objection to the application subject to the imposition of conditions.

Members considered the application noting that the applicant had spent many years and much effort trying to secure planning permission on this site. They were pleased to see that all the hard work by the applicant and Officers had resulted in a positive outcome. Clarification was sought that permitted development rights would be withdrawn, which was confirmed by the Planning Officer.

Members agreed the recommendation.