

ITEM

Application Reference	DC/075969
Location:	Healdwood Bungalow Healdwood Road Romiley Stockport SK6 4AX
PROPOSAL:	Removal of two porches, erection of a new porch, re-roofing and cladding in timber plus removal of existing outrigger and creation of new single storey rear and side extension
Type Of Application:	Full Application
Registration Date:	10.02.2020
Expiry Date:	20.04.2020
Case Officer:	Rachel Bottomley
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Council
Agent:	Mr Hill

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

This application is seeking planning permission for the erection of a single storey front porch following removal of the two existing porches, plus single storey extensions to the side and rear of the property. Permission is also sought for the re-roofing of the property in zinc and the addition of timber cladding to the exterior of the building.

The single storey front porch will measure approximately 1.1 metre in length and 1.9 metres in width. It will have a pitched roof with a ridge and eaves height of approximately 2.8 metres and 2.0 metres respectively replacing two existing porches. The proposed rear extension would extend 2.5 metres to the rear, with a width of 6.0 metres. It would replace an existing conservatory. The proposed side extension would extend 5.0 metres to the Southern side of the property and would extend the full width of the existing main dwellinghouse. The roof of the side extension would be pitched and would tie-in with the existing main roof.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The applicant's detached property is located within a Green Belt 'wedge' between Bredbury, Woodley and Romiley. The property is a red brick bungalow which has been previously extended.

The only neighbouring property is immediately adjacent to the common boundary to the South of the site (Wildervank). This dwellinghouse is sited approximately 20 metres from the proposed side elevation of the proposed extension.

To the West of the site are open fields.

To the North of the site is a wooded area which extends into the application property.

PLANNING HISTORY

DC/074627 - Removal of two porches, erection of a new porch, re-roofing and cladding in timber. Granted 7/11/2019
DC059206 – Side extension to existing bungalow to form new bedroom. Refused 28/8/15
J/35989 – Extension, alteration and renovation to existing bungalow – Granted 24.04.1986
J/37438 – New Bungalow at Healdwood Bungalow, Guywood Lane, Romiley – Refused 14.10.1986 (Appeal Dismissed 07.10.1987)
J/39588 – Extend and rebuild existing bungalow – Granted 23.07.1987
J/48094 – Single Storey Extension – Refused 26.07.1990
DC/002128 – Single Storey Side Extension – Refused 30.10.2000
DC/004116 – Single storey side extension – Granted 22.05.2001

NEIGHBOURS VIEWS

The owners/occupiers of 2 surrounding properties were notified in writing of the application. The neighbour notification period expired on the 20th March 2020. Due to the application being a departure from the development plan, the application has also been advertised by way of site and press notices. No letters of representation have been received regarding the application.

CONSULTEE RESPONSES

No consultations undertaken.

POLICY BACKGROUND

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires applications/appeals to be determined in accordance with the Statutory Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The Statutory Development Plan includes:-

- Policies set out in the Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review May 2006 (SUDP) 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 (CS) adopted 17th March 2011.

The application site is allocated within a Predominantly Residential Area, as defined on the UDP Proposals Map and is sited within Greenbelt. The following policies are therefore relevant in consideration of the proposal :-

Saved policies of the SUDP Review

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

SIE-1: QUALITY PLACES

Supplementary Planning Guidance

Supplementary Planning Document 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' adopted February 2011 following public consultation.

Supplementary Planning Guidance (Saved SPG's & SPD's) does not form part of the Statutory Development Plan; nevertheless it provides non-statutory Council approved guidance that is a material consideration when determining planning applications.

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.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 are:

a) buildings for agriculture and forestry;

b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;

Para.146 “Certain other forms of development are also not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.

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)”.*

NPPF Conformity

The Planning Advisory Services' National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Compatibility Self-Assessment Checklist has been undertaken on Stockport's adopted Core Strategy. This document assesses the conformity of Stockport's adopted Core Strategy with the NPPF and takes account of saved policies from the Unitary Development Plan where applicable. No significant differences were identified therefore the development plan is in conformity with the NPPF.

Planning Practice Guidance

The National 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.

ANALYSIS

Residential Amenity

The proposed alterations to the materials, in terms of the timber cladding and zinc roofing, would not impact on the amenity of the adjacent property 'Wildervank'.

The proposed rear extension would not be visible to this property as it would be screened by the existing main dwellinghouse. Notwithstanding this, the proposed rear extension would have no greater impact, in terms of residential amenity, than the existing conservatory.

The proposed porch alterations would not impact on the amenity of the adjacent neighbouring property.

The proposed side elevation would be sited over 2.0 metres from the shared boundary with Wildervank. Additionally, no windows are proposed in the side elevation facing towards this property. In addition, the presence of vegetation, including mature two trees, coupled with a high wall on the common boundary would screen the property between the two properties.

As such, it is considered that the proposed extensions and alterations would not unduly impact on the residential privacy or amenity of any surrounding property in accordance with UDP policy CDH1.8 and Core Strategy policy SIE-1.

Design

The proposed side extension respects the architecture of the existing house by utilising the existing gabled-end roof design. It is considered that this element would be in keeping with the existing main dwellinghouse.

The proposed rear extension would replace an existing conservatory. The roof would not exceed the roof of the existing main dwellinghouse and the gable element to the rear of the extension would reflect the gable elements to either side of the existing main dwellinghouse.

The use of the proposed zinc materials for the roof and the timber cladding to the external walls have already been assessed and considered acceptable as part of the previously approved application (DC/074627). The materials proposed are deemed acceptable as there is an existing timber clad outbuilding to the adjacent neighbour and protected trees surround the site. It is considered that the proposal respects the design, scale, materials, character, appearance and proportions of the existing dwelling and would preserve character and appearance of the surrounding area.

The replacement of two separate porches and the replacement with one single porch to the front of the property is considered to be a visual improvement.

In view of the above, it is considered that the proposal would respect the design, scale, materials, character, appearance and proportions of the existing dwelling and would not result in harm to the character of the street scene, the visual amenity of the area in accordance with UDP policy CDH1.8 and Core Strategy policy SIE-1.

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. 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 interpretation of significant change will vary according to the character of the property but as a general guideline, extensions which increase the volume of the original dwelling by more than about one third are unlikely to be acceptable.

The material test to the acceptability of proposals within the Green Belt is the impact of the siting, size and scale of the proposal on the character and appearance of the dwelling and on the overall openness of the Green Belt.

The case officer has conducted volume calculations to assess the impact of the proposal on the green belt. The extension would create a 29% increase on the current volume of the house.

However, it is noted that the property has benefited from a number of separate extensions over the past 30 years. Therefore the new proposed volume would be an increase of 113% on the volume of the original dwellinghouse, as approved in 1987. It is accepted that this would exceed the acceptable limitation of one third referred to in UDP policy GBA1.5.

A statement of very special circumstances has been submitted to accompany the application. The statement states that the Healdwood Bungalow benefits from permitted development rights. This assumption is based on the officers report from application DC/059206 in which he states:

'From reference to definition of 'original' dwelling in the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) (Order) 2015 and for purposes of this assessment, the rebuild and extension as approved and implemented through planning permission J/39588 is considered the 'original dwelling'.'

And goes on to state:

'Permitted development rights have not been removed for this property.'

The statement points out that none of the proposed extensions are higher than the existing roof height and are less than 4m in height. Therefore the form of these alterations fall within permitted development and should therefore be accepted as a departure from the greenbelt policy. The materials used in this application are identical to the materials approved in application DC/074627 (removal of two porches, erection of a new porch, re-roofing and cladding in timber). While it may be argued that to be 'permitted development' the external appearance of the extensions should match the 'original dwelling', we believe the optimal outcome would be a unified appearance using the materials approved in the application DC/074627. We submit that for the reasons outlined above that the application should be approved.

As part of the assessment of the proposal, an analysis of the planning history of the site has been undertaken and there is no evidence that permitted development rights have been removed for this property.

It is accepted that the proposed extension is of a scale which could be classed as permitted development. Furthermore, whilst the materials would not match the existing dwellinghouse, the materials would match those which have been approved in the previous application. The points outlined in the submitted statement of very special circumstances are acceptable.

Furthermore, due to the property being sited adjacent to the wooded area to the North of the application site, it would be predominantly screened from wider views around the property and therefore the impact on the openness of the greenbelt would be negligible.

A condition to remove permitted development rights from the property, and therefore limiting any subsequent extensions to the property, can be added to the decision notice.

It is therefore considered that the resulting dwellinghouse would not result in an unacceptable impact on the openness of the greenbelt.

For the reasons stated above, it is considered that 'very special circumstances' can be demonstrated.

Trees

There are protected trees surrounding the site, therefore two conditions are recommended to ensure that there would be no impact upon the trees within and surrounding the site during construction work.

SUMMARY

The proposal would not unduly impact on the residential amenity of the surrounding properties, in accordance with UDP policy CDH1.8 and Core Strategy policy SIE-1.

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 conservation area in accordance with UDP policy CDH1.8 Core Strategy policy SIE-1.

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.

Whilst the proposal constitutes inappropriate development by definition, it would have only limited harm to the openness of the Green Belt and the case for very special circumstances is sufficient to outweigh harm by reason of inappropriateness. 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