

## **ITEM**

<b>Application Reference</b>	<b>DC/072037</b>
<b>Location:</b>	202 Woodford Road Woodford Stockport SK7 1QF
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Proposed two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension.
<b>Type Of Application:</b>	Householder
<b>Registration Date:</b>	07.01.2019
<b>Expiry Date:</b>	04.03.2019
<b>Case Officer:</b>	Callum Coyne
<b>Applicant:</b>	Andrew Mascoll
<b>Agent:</b>	P4B Extend Ltd

### **DELEGATION/COMMITTEE STATUS**

The application should be referred to the Planning & Highways Regulations Committee as the application relates to a departure from the Statutory Development Plan.

### **DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT**

The application proposes to demolish the existing 2 storey side extension located adjacent to the boundary with 200 Woodford Road and single storey building behind. In its place it is proposed to erect a with a 2 storey front bay window and hipped roof to match the existing house together with a flat roofed rear extension.

The proposed side extension would be 3.5m wide and extend the full depth of the 2 storey house. The single storey rear extension behind would project 7.2 metres beyond the rear elevation of the main house and have a maximum height of 4.1 metres.

### **SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

The application site comprises a two-storey detached dwelling house with a large rear garden located within the Green Belt. The property currently benefits from a two-storey side extension to the southern side elevation and a two-storey side extension with a garage/carport to the northern side elevation. To the front is a porch and carport and to the rear is a single storey extension. To the rear of the plot mature vegetation provides screening from the south west.

The surrounding area is characterised mainly with two storey residential dwelling houses with a varied roof designs. A number of properties within the immediate streetscene and wider area have been previously extended which consist of a white render finish at both ground floor and first floor level.

Levels within the application are approximately 500mm below street level whilst the tarmac front driveway is screened behind a close boarded timber fencing boundary treatment which is approximately 2 metres tall.

### **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 31<sup>st</sup> 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 17<sup>th</sup> March 2011 and

Policies set out in the Woodford Neighbourhood Plan adopted September 2019.

#### **Saved policies of the SUDP Review**

LCR1.1: LANDSCAPE CHARACTER AREAS

LCR1.1a THE URBAN FRINGE INCLUDING THE RIVER VALLEYS

GBA1.1: EXTENT OF GREEN BELT

GBA1.2: CONTROL OF DEVELOPMENT IN GREEN BELT

GBA1.5: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT IN GREEN BELT

CDH1.8: RESIDENTIAL EXTENSIONS

#### **LDF Core Strategy/Development Management policies**

SD-2: MAKING IMPROVEMENTS TO EXISTING DWELLINGS

H-1: DESIGN OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

CS8: SAFEGUARDING AND IMPROVING THE ENVIRONMENT

SIE-1: Quality Places

SIE-3: Protecting, Safeguarding and enhancing the Environment

#### **Policies of the Woodford Neighbourhood Plan**

DEV3 – Extensions to Existing Dwellings

DEV4 – Design of New Development

#### **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.

'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' Supplementary Planning Document (adopted in February 2011) states that the issue of design is a highly important factor when the Council assessed proposals for extensions and alterations to a dwelling. The Council

require all development to be designed to a high standard in order that it makes a positive contribution to the provision of an attractive built environment.

### **National Planning Policy Framework**

A Revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) issued by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) on 19th February 2019 replaced the previous NPPF (originally issued 2012 & revised 2018). The NPPF has not altered the fundamental legal requirement under Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 that decisions must be made in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations (such as the NPPF) indicate otherwise.

The NPPF representing the governments up-to-date planning policy which should be taken into account in dealing with applications focuses on achieving a lasting housing reform, facilitating the delivery of a greater number of homes, 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. If decision takers choose not to follow the NPPF, then clear and convincing reasons for doing so are needed.

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.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 are:*

*c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;*

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/8138; Type: XHS; Address: 202, Woodford Road, Bramhall; Proposal: Car Port; Decision Date: 17-FEB-77; Decision: GRANTED

DC/008809; Type: FUL; Address: 202, Woodford Road, Woodford, Stockport, Cheshire, SK7 1QF; Proposal: Two storey side extension, first floor side extension, single storey rear extension and single storey front extension; Decision Date: 16-OCT-02; Decision: REFUSED

Reason for refusal:

The proposed extensions would significantly change the scale, character and appearance of the property and would be harmful to the openness of the Greater Manchester Green Belt, within which the site is located. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy UC 1.5 of the Stockport Unitary Development Plan.

[Officer note: The proposed development would have resulted in an increase in volume of approximately 65% over the original property.]

DC/010822; Type: FUL; Address: 202 Woodford Road, Woodford, Stockport, Cheshire, SK7 1QF; Proposal: Two storey side extension, single storey side extension, single

storey rear extension and single storey front extension (Re-Submission: DC/008809);  
Decision Date: 06-MAY-03; Decision: GRANTED

[Officer note: Following the previous refusal, the revised scheme removed the first floor side extension element to the northern side elevation. The resultant development consisted of an increase in volume of approximately 50% over the original property, which was considered to be acceptable in this specific instance.]

### **NEIGHBOUR'S VIEWS**

No letters of representation were received during the neighbour consultation period.

### **CONSULTEE RESPONSES**

Woodford Neighbourhood Forum – No comments

### **ANALYSIS**

#### Amenity

The proposed two-storey side extension would be positioned 1.2 metres from the side boundary with 200 Woodford Road. There are no primary habitable room windows located within the side elevation of this property facing the application site. On this basis, and noting that the proposed 2 storey extension would project no further to the rear than the existing house, it is considered that this extension would appear overbearing or unneighbourly when viewed from 200 Woodford Road.

Any overlooking from the proposed first floor windows of the side extension to the rear would be no greater than that which already occurs in this suburban location. The proposal would also maintain an adequate separation distance between the proposed side extension and the front elevation of 203 Woodford Road situated opposite.

Notwithstanding this, a condition is recommended to ensure that no additional windows, doors or openings of any kind shall be inserted in the side elevation facing 200 Woodford Road.

The proposed single storey rear extension would be positioned 1.2 metres from the common boundary with 200 Woodford Road would have a flat roof, a maximum eaves height of 4.1 metres. This extension would project the same distance to the rear as that existing to be demolished. Whilst it would be wider than existing, this increased width is away from 200 Woodford Road and over 5.5 metres from the boundary with 204 Woodford Road. No windows are proposed within the side elevation of the proposed development facing 200 Woodford Road, however floor to ceiling windows are proposed to the elevation facing 204 Woodford Road albeit over 5.5m from this boundary. For these reasons it is not considered that the single storey rear extension will give rise to an adverse impact on either neighbouring occupier.

The proposal therefore accords with saved policy CDH1.8 of the Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review, policy SIE-1 the adopted Stockport Core Strategy DPD together with DEV3 and DEV4 of the WNP.

### Design

The proposed development would respect the design, scale, materials, character, appearance and proportions of the existing dwelling and surrounding area would not result in harm to the character of the street scene or the visual amenity of the local area.

The proposed flat roof rear extension would be contemporary in design however; the proposal would be located to the rear of the property and screened from along Woodford Road.

The proposed two-storey side extension would provide symmetry with the creation of double fronted dwelling with a central entrance porch. The materials proposed would match the existing with white render finish, a matching bay window and corner brick detail to mirror the design of the existing dwelling and would not result in an incongruous addition to the streetscene.

On this basis, the proposed development is considered acceptable in design terms and accords with saved policy SIE-1 of the adopted Stockport Core Strategy DPD, saved policy CDH1.8 of the Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review, the guidelines set out in the 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' SPD, Policy DEV3 and DEV4 of the Woodford Neighbourhood Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

### Green Belt

Saved UDP Policy GBA1.2 states that there is a presumption against the construction of new buildings within the Green Belt unless it is for certain purposes including limited extension and alterations to existing dwellings where the scale, character and appearance of the property are not significantly changed.

Saved UDP policy GBA1.5 states that proposals relating to existing residential uses may be permitted in certain cases, including alterations and extensions where the scale, character and appearance of the property would not be significantly changed.

The supporting text to these policies advises that the interpretation of significant change will vary according to the character of the property but as a general guideline, extensions that increase the volume of the original dwelling by more than approximately one third are unlikely to be acceptable.

The National Planning Policy Framework was published in 2012 and updated in 2019 sets out the Government's 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). A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as 'inappropriate' in

the Green Belt; exceptions to this are (amongst other matters) the extension and alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building (para 145c).

As per planning history and based upon the figures within the supporting statement, the existing dwelling, as constructed on site (ref: DC/010822) currently represents a 50% uplift in volume to the original dwelling.

The proposed development coupled with previous extensions would result in a 93% increase in the volume of the original building (29% beyond that existing). This clearly exceeds the guidance set out above and would result in a disproportionate addition to the original dwelling. The proposed development is therefore inappropriate in the Green Belt and can only be approved in very special circumstances.

In support of their application then applicant has submitted a planning statement outlining what they consider to be very special circumstances. These can be summarised as follows;

- The use, access, amount, layout scale, appearance and landscape of the proposed development are appropriate and in-keeping with the context of the area and will enhance the aesthetics and amenity of the site, its surrounds and the local community.
- The proposal includes the demolition of an existing single storey rear extension and a single storey side extension. The proposed two-storey side extension projects the same as the existing side extension but utilises the unused space which the car port is currently occupying.
- The proposed single storey rear extension would provide a large open plan living space for the family to enjoy which is appropriate to the scale of the dwelling and surrounding dwellings.
- The proposed development would increase the number of bedrooms from 4 to 5 bedroom home however the overall footprint of the building does not increase significantly leaving minimal impact on the openness of the green belt.
- The footprint of the existing single storey side extension (including the carport) and the footprint of the proposed side extension are similar in size. The proposal better utilising the space better within the site and in comparison to the existing dwelling constructed on site would not have a detrimental impact upon the openness of the Green Belt.
- The size and scale of the proposal is in keeping with the surrounding dwellings and would result in a positive contribution to the overall character.
- The proposal allows space to gain access down the side of the dwelling to allow easier access to the rear the garden for bin storage and maintenance.
- Furthermore, the total volume of permitted development extensions would not have such a positive impact on the character of the dwelling and would not be as aesthetically pleasing as the current proposed scheme.

The above circumstances are noted and in response to the case presented by the applicant, Members are advised accordingly:-



The application site is located within a ribbon of development with a suburban character. The resulting development will be of a similar size, scale and height to other existing development in the locality, will not obstruct any existing views through the site to the open Green Belt beyond and will project no further to the rear than other adjacent houses on this side of Woodford Road into the open undeveloped areas of the Green Belt.

It is acknowledged that the proposal would significantly increase the size of the original house constructed; however it is considered that the proposed two storey side and single storey rear extensions would generally appear subordinate in relation to the existing dwelling currently erected on site.

The proposed extension is materially larger than the previously refused extension, increasing the volumetric uplift from 50% to a 93% uplift to the original dwelling. The proposed development therefore represents a scheme that is almost twice as large as the previously refused scheme.

Notwithstanding this, Members are advised that the proposal represent a 29% net increase in volume to the existing dwelling (as currently constructed on site). Furthermore, the suburban character and appearance of Woodford Road and the surrounding area has significantly changed over the past 15 years and must be considered as a material planning consideration as part of this assessment.

It is acknowledged that the property benefits from full permitted development rights for the erection of extensions and/or outbuildings. Therefore, following the demolition of previous extensions, a single storey or indeed a two-storey rear extension could be constructed without any control from the Local Planning Authority as well as outbuildings to the rear of the house, which could have a similar impact on the openness of the Green Belt.

Taking into account the above, Members are advised that whilst the proposed development is clearly inappropriate in the Green Belt and contrary to policies GBA1.2 and GBA1.5 of the UDP Review and paragraph 145 of the NPPF, it is considered that very special circumstances exist to justify that development and outweigh the harm to the Green Belt.

Notwithstanding the above, given the percentage increase proposed, a condition should however be imposed to remove Permitted Development rights in relation to extensions to the dwelling under Class A of the General Permitted Development Order. This will afford the Local Planning Authority the opportunity to consider the impact of such extensions upon the Green Belt and the amenities of neighbouring occupiers taking into account the footprint and rearward projection of the dwelling as currently proposed.

### Trees

Policies in the Stockport Core Strategy and Woodford Neighbourhood Plan seek to protect trees, hedges and verges. The proposed development is not within or affected

by a Conservation Area, and furthermore there are no legally protected trees within the curtilage of this site or neighbouring plots.

As stated within the application form no trees or hedges will be removed or pruned in order to carry out the proposed development and following an officer site visit it is considered that the scheme as a whole will not have a negative impact on the trees in the area.

The proposal therefore accords with policy SIE-1 and SIE-3 of the adopted Stockport Core Strategy DPD and policy ENV3 of the Woodford Neighbourhood Plan.

#### Highways

The proposed development would not have any negative impact upon parking or highway safety as parking space for at least two cars would remain to the front driveway.

The proposal is considered acceptable in relation to parking provision and therefore accords with policy CS9, T-1, T-2 and T-3 of the adopted Stockport Core Strategy DPD the guidelines set out in the 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

#### Conclusions

The proposal represents a volume increase of approximately 93% increase to the original dwelling; the proposal is therefore considered a departure from the Council's Development Plan and para 145 of the NPPF. Whilst the proposal constitutes inappropriate development, it is considered that the case for very special circumstances is sufficient to outweigh harm by reason of inappropriateness.

The general design of the proposed development is considered acceptable in terms of its relationship to the existing dwelling, the character of the street scene and the visual amenity of the area in accordance with UDP policy CDH1.8 and Core Strategy policy SIE-1, the guidelines set out in the 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' SPD, Policy DEV3 and DEV4 of the Woodford Neighbourhood Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

The proposal would not unduly impact upon the residential amenity of the surrounding properties in accordance with UDP policy CDH1.8 and Core Strategy policy SIE-1, the guidelines set out in the 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other material considerations such as the Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings SPD and the NPPF have also been considered and it is judged the proposal also complies with the content of these documents. There are no other material considerations that warrant refusal of this scheme.

On balance, the proposal amounts to Sustainable Development, consequently it is recommended that permission be granted subject to appropriate planning conditions.

**RECOMMENDATION** GRANT subject to conditions