ITEM

Application Reference	**DC/077092**
Location:	505 Chester Road Woodford Stockport SK7 1PR
PROPOSAL:	Erection of extensions to existing dwelling
Type Of Application:	Householder
Registration Date:	09.07.2020
Expiry Date:	03.09.2020 – Extension of time agreed to 27th November 2020
Case Officer:	James Appleton
Applicant:	Prof. Wasat & Samina Mansoor
Agent:	Plan:8 Town Planning Ltd

UPDATE

This application was deferred from consideration at the meeting of the Area Committee on 1st October 2020. This was to allow amendments to be made to the report which are now set out below.

COMMITTEE STATUS

Should the Bramhall & Cheadle Hulme South Area Committee be minded to grant permission under the Delegation Agreement 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 seeks planning permission for the erection of a first floor front extension, two storey side extension with a front & rear dormer, two storey front extension, two storey rear extension, single storey side & rear extension.

There will be a two storey side extension measuring 6.9m to the ridge and 3.7m to the eaves. The extension will contain a maximum width of 3.5m and a length of 6.8m. There will be a front and rear dormer proposed to the extension. The front dormer would measure 2.5metres in height by 1.8metres in width and would project approximately 2.5metres from the rear roof slope equalling 7.88 cubic metres. The proposed rear dormer would measure 2.5metres in height by 1.8metres in width and would project approximately 3.8metres from the rear roof slope equalling 11.97 cubic metres.

The first floor front extension will measure 2.4m in length with a width of 5.5m. It will contain a pitched roof measuring 8.1m to the ridge and 5m to the eaves.

Permission is also sought for a two storey front extension measuring 6.5m to the ridge and 5m to the eaves. The extension will contain a width of 3m and a length of 1m. The existing front projecting gable element will be increased in height to a ridge height of 8m and the roof of the front porch will be replaced with a flat roof measuring 3m high. Two roof lights will be inserted within the front roofslope,

Also proposed are 2no two storey rear extensions measuring 2m in length, the extension towards the east of the dwelling will contain a width of 5.4m and the extension towards the west of the dwelling will contain a width of 5m. Both extension contain dual pitched roofs with a ridge and eaves height of 8m (western side contains a ridge height of 8.1m) and 5m respectively. Other works proposed to the rear is the removal of the existing conservatory with a replacement flat roof single storey rear extension with a maximum height of 3.1m containing a lantern above approx. 200mm high. The extension contains a length and width of 2.5m and 12.3m respectively. There is one rooflight proposed to the rear roofslope and a rear dormer measuring 3metres in height by 1.8 metres in width.

A single storey side and rear extension is proposed linking a detached swimming pool with a 'lobby' into the side of the dwelling. The extension contains a maximum length of 22m, a maximum width of 12.1m. The extensions will be subservient to the dwelling containing dual pitched roofs with a maximum ridge height of 6.2m and an eaves height of 2.5m.

The proposed extensions would be constructed using render and matching tiles. A Planning Support Statement has been submitted accompanying the application.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application site comprises a large two-storey detached dwelling house with a large front and rear garden located within the Green Belt.

The host dwelling is situated to the southern side of Chester Road in a long and established ribbon of development in Woodford. The area is washed over by Green Belt designation. There is a Definitive Right of Way to the western boundary of the site.

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.

The host dwelling is original as built in 1985 (J/32780) apart from a single storey rear conservatory which will be removed as part of the proposal.

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
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;

d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces".

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/32780 – Land Adjacent 503 Chester Road Woodford - New residential dwelling house with ancillary garages and stores. Granted 05.02.1985

NEIGHBOUR'S VIEWS
The owners/occupiers of ten surrounding properties were notified in writing of the application. The neighbour notification period expired on the 2nd August 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 that expire on the 7th October 2020. One letter of representation have been received citing the following grounds of objection :

- With respect we would request that the plans are amended to remove the 1st floor window from the dressing room within the master bedroom suite.
- This window directly overlooks: - our kitchen/ dining room (both the window and French doors) - our back door - 1st floor bedroom - rear patio
- The addition of this new window would directly overlook these areas of our property and result in an invasion of privacy.
- The window appears to be less than 15 metres from our windows and patio. We very much enjoy our privacy in these areas.
- We would ask that this small amendment is made in order to avoid this loss of privacy.

CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Woodford Neighbourhood Forum – We acknowledge that the existing house is very attractive and the proposal would produce a very grand residence. However, we are concerned that the proposal does not comply with national and local policies and we are keen to ensure that we are consistent in the application of policy principles.

We note the following reference in the Planning Support Statement: "….the infill property at 512 Chester Road, across Chester Road, has been approved so that dwelling will fill much of the width of the plot." The planning application for 512 Chester Road was submitted before WNF became a consultee, but members of the WNF committee consider that this property is much too large and overbearing in this location and so has a detrimental impact on the character of village. It provides an example of the sensitivity of the location to change due to inappropriate development.

The site of the 505 Chester Road proposal is in Green Belt and would create a massive increase in the size of the existing property, which is incompatible with the prevailing planning policies at national, borough and local level. The proposal would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing buildings.

The proposal would result in loss of open garden space, which will have an impact on the rural character of the village because it is located in a prominent position on Chester Road and adjacent to the start of footpath 99HGB, which leads into open fields behind the housing line.

It would reduce the gap between this dwelling and the one to the east on Chester Road, affecting the street scene. It would potentially affect the amenity of neighbouring properties by filling open spaces between them with buildings.

It does not fulfil any unmet need in terms of type of housing. There is no shortage of large detached houses in Woodford. Planning permission for 920 dwellings + commercial premises + a care facility on the former aerodrome site includes proposals for large numbers of additional large houses. A survey conducted by the Forum identified a demand for 2-bedroomed properties. Extension of an already large house is not going in the right direction for meeting that need.

The Planning statement refers to the NPPF 2019 and the Woodford Neighbourhood Plan 2019, but makes no reference to, or any assessment of, the other relevant

Stockport Council Planning policies forming part of the Development Plan for the Woodford area.

The proposal appears to contravene policies in the Woodford Neighbourhood Plan, NPPF, SMBC Saved UDP and Core Strategy policies.

We are pleased to note that the Planning Statement submitted with the application refers to the Woodford Neighbourhood Plan. It refers to WNP DEV3, but WNP DEV4, which is also relevant, is not mentioned.

We have assessed the proposal against policies in the Woodford Neighbourhood Plan (WNP):-

Policy DEV3: Extensions to existing dwellings: The addition of a utility room and a boot room along the Chester Road frontage to the east will significantly reduce the gap between the adjacent property at 503 Chester Road, and potentially create a terracing effect. This does not comply with WNP DEV3 which seeks to ensure that extensions are in keeping with the host property and surroundings and do not reduce gaps and create a terracing effect.

DEV4: Design of new development: This policy is not reference by the application and seeks ensure a high standard of design, respect and respond to the Neighbourhood Area's rural character, to its ecology and to its landscape. Along this section of Chester Road, large houses are set in large gardens with substantial gaps between buildings. The proposal would have a detrimental impact on the rural character of Woodford as the scheme seeks to significantly increase the length of the front elevation and add further extensions to other sections of the property, thus filling much more of the plot with buildings.This does not comply with WNP DEV4.

Flood Risk: Woodford is in an area liable to surface flooding. The fields between this property and the aerodrome site are frequently water-logged. Further to consultation with the Environment Agency, the Neighbourhood Forum would like to see new development being designed to maximise the retention of surface water on the development site and measures to minimise runoff; for surface water drainage to be considered in liaison with the Local Lead Flood Agency, the public sewerage undertaker and the Environment Agency; and for surface water to be discharged in hierarchical approach set out in the NPPF.

Green Belt: The site lies wholly within the Green Belt with the house and swimming pool currently as two separate buildings at a distance from each other, which allows for some openness within this rural location in Woodford. The proposal would represent a further encroachment into the countryside by new substantial additions to the house and link buildings between the current house and swimming pool. The site makes some contribution to the openness of the Green Belt at this point. The proposal would have a much greater impact on the openness than the current house and swimming pool due to the scale of development proposed.

There are no special circumstances that would justify the harm caused to the Green Belt by this proposal. The outline case put forward by the applicant to justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt does not constitute very special circumstances sufficient to outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm to the Green Belt.

The extension of this dwelling will result in a 85% increase in volume over the original dwelling or 72% increase if the pool is included.

The application is therefore contrary to para's 134, 143, 144 and 145c of the NPPF or policies GBA1.2, GBA1.5, GBA1.6, GBA1.7 and LCR1.1 of the Stockport UDP Review.

We believe that planning permission should be refused because the proposal does not comply with WNP DEV3, or WNP DEV4. It fails to comply with the NPPF paragraphs 134, 143, 144 and 145 and with paragraphs GBA1.1, GBA1.2, GBA1.5, GBA1.6 and GBA1.7 and policy LCR1.1 in the Stockport UDP. Therefore, it is inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

The proposal is set in a ribbon of well-spaced houses within countryside in a prominent position in Woodford adjacent to the start of a footpath. The proposal represents a massive increase in volume of development, which would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than existing buildings and there are no exceptional circumstances which justify the harm to the Green Belt. It would be encroachment into green space, which would results in a cramming effect in the housing line and harm the rural character of the locality.

ANALYSIS

Residential Amenity

CDH 1.8: RESIDENTIAL EXTENSIONS states that extensions to residential properties are only permissible where they complement the existing dwelling in terms of design, scale and materials and do not adversely affect the character of the street scene.

The Councils 'Extensions and Alterations' SPD states that an extension which is sited close to a window belonging to a habitable room of a neighbouring dwelling or its private garden area, can create a poor living environment for the occupier in terms of overshadowing and intrusiveness.

In determining planning applications for extensions the most common problem is the affect on the amenities of neighbouring properties. Poorly designed or overly large extensions can cause a loss of outlook, overshadowing or an overbearing impact to neighbouring properties. Extensions which cause an unacceptable loss of privacy or outlook to neighbouring properties, or look out of keeping with the character of the street, will be refused.

The proposal will be located to the south-east and approximately 14m away (at its closest point) from 509 Chester Road. The application property is set back from this neighbour. There are no windows proposed in the side elevation of the proposal, there was a first floor window proposed to the side elevation facing this neighbour however this has since been removed due to concerns regarding overlooking to this neighbour. The closest proposed first floor window to this neighbour will be obscure glazed and therefore it is considered that the proposed works would not result in any unacceptable loss of privacy, light or outlook.

The proposal will be located to the south-west and approximately 4m away (at its closest point) from 503 Chester Road. The application property is set back from this neighbour, there are no windows proposed in the side elevation of the proposal. The closest proposed first floor window to this neighbour will be obscure glazed and

therefore it is considered that the proposed works would not result in any unacceptable loss of privacy, light or outlook.

The neighbouring property to the rear at 507 Chester Road is located at an angle and is approximately 34m away from the main bulk of the dwelling which is considered acceptable as there is a minimum separation distance standard of 25m between directly rear facing properties. The swimming pool is located approximately 14m away from this neighbour and this will replicate the existing relationship. The facing properties to the front are 55m away. As such, it is considered that the proposed extensions 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

Policy SIE-1: Quality Place of the Core Strategy recognises that specific regard should be had to the sites' context in relation to surrounding buildings and spaces.

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. This does not mean that a new development has to exactly replicate the style and character of the existing building or its locality, but it should be harmonious with what is already there. The character of an area is reflected in the layout, massing, scale, height, style and materials of buildings and the spaces around them. Any extension or alteration to a property should:-

• Respect the form, shape, symmetry and proportions of the existing dwelling and compliment the character of the surrounding area (DESIGN)
• Generally appear subordinate in relation to the existing dwelling in terms of massing, scale and overall appearance (SCALE)
• Respect the architectural integrity of the existing dwelling. External materials and finishes should be durable and of good quality. They should be visually appropriate for their surroundings and sympathetic in terms of colour, texture and detail in relation to the existing dwelling (MATERIALS).

The SPD recognises that extensions should respect and complement the architectural. Special attention should be given to matters such as siting, scale, height, massing, detailed design and appropriate use of materials. The Council wishes to protect the boroughs buildings and residential areas from unsympathetic changes by ensuring that new extensions are designed in context with their surroundings.

Policy DEV3 of the Woodford Neighbourhood Plan 'Extensions to Existing Dwellings' states that "residential extensions should be in keeping with the host property and its surroundings. Development that would reduce an existing gap between properties should not create an incongruous "terracing" effect."

Policy DEV4 of the WNP requires development to achieve a high level of design, responding to the rural character of the area.

There are mixture of external materials and noticeable render features on properties within the surrounding area, therefore the materials proposed are deemed acceptable. The extensions will not extend beyond the ridgeline of the existing

dwelling and those projecting to the rear of the dwelling will not be visually prominent from the front of the property. The positioning of the application property behind both neighbouring houses and the siting of the extensions at 1.5m off each side boundary will ensure that no terracing effect will occur. The extensions would broadly respect the architecture of the existing dwelling house and the extensions would have a roof matching the existing roof. As such, the proposal will appear subservient to the existing dwelling.

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 surrounding area would not result in harm to the character of the street scene, the visual amenity of the area or the in accordance with UDP policy CDH1.8 and Core Strategy policy SIE-1 and Policies DEV3 and DEV4 of the WNP.

Green Belt/Landscape Character Area

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 approximately one third are unlikely to be acceptable.

There are no policies in the Woodford Neighbourhood Plan that relate to the extension of dwellings within the Green Belt with policy DEV1 relating to limited infilling between dwellings rather than the extension of dwellings.

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).

The original property has been calculated of having a volume of 783 cubic metres. There is no previous planning history on site for the construction of the swimming pool, therefore the swimming pool has been included in the volume calculations. The volume of the swimming pool is 192 cubic metres and therefore the original overall development has a volume of 975 cubic metres. The existing dwelling has been calculated of having a volume of 1,031 cubic metres however the conservatory will be removed as part of the works therefore the volume increase calculation have been taken from the original property.

The volume of the proposed extensions equals 705 cubic metres which is a 72% volume increase of the original dwelling. In this respect, the volume of the proposed extensions would clearly exceed the one-third increase in volume referenced in policy GBA1.5 and for the purposes of para 145c of the NPPF would be considered disproportionate to the size of the original building. The proposal would therefore represent inappropriate development within the Green Belt and in accordance with para 143 of the NPPF can only be approved where special circumstances exist.

Para 144 confirms that in considering any planning application, substantial weight should be 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 its inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

The agent for the application has submitted a planning statement where “very special circumstances” to justify the scheme should be considered, the conclusions of which are provided below;

- Permitted Development fall-back
- An alternative replacement dwelling could offer a very similar size to the preferred extensions
- The site is in an area of ribbon development
- This and surrounding sites are in very spacious plots (houses considerably set back from the frontage with large gardens)
- There are numerous examples of other properties that have been extended with larger two storey extensions that fill more of the plot.
- New infill development can and has been approved in the Green Belt in Woodford where the volume approved is significantly larger than that proposed with the proposed extensions; planning permission DC/061474 allowed a new build houses that fills much of the width of the plot.

Members are advised that in assessing harm to the openness of the Green Belt, consideration must be given to the spatial and visual impacts of the development. Clearly in spatial terms, the existence of the extensions will cause harm as they will occupy a space that is currently open at present. In visual terms and taking into account some of the very special circumstances set out above, it is consider that there will be limited harm as outlined below.

The permitted development fall-back scheme would have a volume of 702 cubic metres which would result in a 68% volume increase of the original dwelling. Whilst this is slightly less than the proposed increase of 72% the permitted development fall-back scheme contains flat roof side extensions that are not aesthetically pleasing or complement the existing dwelling and surrounding area. This permitted development scheme also includes three outbuildings which would encroach further into the undeveloped areas of the Green Belt. In comparison the development proposed by this application would have reduced impact on the openness of the Green Belt by being concentrated around the existing building and being of a design sympathetic with the character of this building. Whilst this permitted development scheme does not wholly justify the proposed development it does set out what development could be carried out without the need for planning permission in the event that this application were refused and the harm that would be caused to the Green Belt as a result of this. This is considered to carry weight in the determination of this application.

The agent has suggested that a replacement dwelling could result in a development of a similar size to that currently proposed. Members are advised that whilst this may be the case, such a dwelling being materially larger than that existing would also be inappropriate in the Green Belt and could also only be approved in very special circumstances. In the absence of such a scheme or indicative plans to elaborate on this it is concluded that this scenario would not amount to providing the very special circumstances required.

Notwithstanding the above it is accepted that the application property is located in a ribbon of development where there are houses of varying size including many large houses of a similar scale to that proposed by this application. This adjacent existing development not only extends to either side of the application site but also to the front and to the rear. As such, being contained within the pattern of existing development around the site, the proposed extensions would not encroach into the wider undeveloped areas of the Green Belt nor would result in the sprawl of this ribbon development

When viewed from Chester Road, whilst the proposed extensions would reduce the gaps between the application property and those neighbouring to either side, it is not considered that they would have a harmful visual impact upon the Green Belt. To the east, a gap would remain between the application property and 503 Chester Road whilst to the west, the extensions would be single storey, set back from the front elevation of the main dwelling and not visually prominent; this is evidenced in the existing and proposed streetscenes appended to this agenda.

The presence of the public right of way along the western boundary of the site is noted and it is accepted that the erection of the proposed extensions along this boundary will interrupt the existing view between the house and pool building. Notwithstanding that, the property currently benefits from permitted development rights which, if this application were refused, could enable the erection of development in this same location. This PD fall back position is material to the consideration of this application as it is accepted that such development could have a similar if not greater impact on the Green Belt than that proposed by this application.

Having regard to the above, it is concluded that whilst there will be some spatial impact upon the openness of the Green Belt, any visual impact will be limited and not unacceptable. In this respect it is concluded that very special circumstances have been demonstrated and whilst the development remains inappropriate in the Green Belt, in accordance with para's 143 and 144 of the NPPF, the development can be approved.

Should planning permission be granted, a condition should however be imposed removing all permitted development rights associated with the erection of further extensions and outbuildings to the dwelling. This condition is considered necessary principally in terms of the impact of such future development upon the Green Belt.

The objections by Woodford Neighbourhood Forum are noted however for the reasons stated above, it is considered that the inappropriate development in the Green Belt is justified by the presence of very special circumstances. Members are advised that the reference to policy GBA1.7 by WNF is not relevant to this application as the site does not fall within a Major Existing Developed Site as defined on the UDP Proposals Map.

Policy LCR1.1 of the UDP review confirms that development in the countryside will be strictly controlled and will not be permitted unless it protects and enhances the quality and character of the rural area. Development should be sensitively sited, design and constructed of materials appropriate to the locality. For the reasons stated above it is considered that the proposal is in compliance with the policy and will not cause harm to the Landscape Character Area.

<u>Highways</u>

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.

Flood Risk and Drainage
The application site falls within Environment Agency Flood Zone 1, which is assessed as having the lowest possibility of flooding; as such a Flood Risk Assessment is not required.

An Energy Efficiency Checklist has not been submitted in support of the application, however this can be conditioned and does not prevent the determination of this application.

SUMMARY
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 proposal would not unduly impact on the residential amenity of the surrounding properties or prejudice a similar development by a neighbour, in accordance with UDP policy CDH1.8 and 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.

By definition the proposal constitutes inappropriate development, however it is considered that 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

BRAMHALL AND CHEADLE HULME SOUTH AREA COMMITTEE 12TH NOVEMBER 2020

The Planning Officer introduced the application and answered questions from Members. Members considered the proposal and agreed the recommendation with a recommendation condition removing permitted development rights.