

## ITEM

<b>Application Reference</b>	<b>DC/077912</b>
<b>Location:</b>	529 Chester Road Woodford Stockport SK7 1PR
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Proposed extended house with a new dormer roof and rear extension
<b>Type Of Application:</b>	Householder
<b>Registration Date:</b>	09.09.2020
<b>Expiry Date:</b>	04.11.2020 - Extension of time agreed to 15 <sup>th</sup> February 2021
<b>Case Officer:</b>	James Appleton
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mr J McGrath
<b>Agent:</b>	Plan:8 Town Planning Ltd

### **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 loft conversion with dormer extensions including an increase in the ridge height of the existing dwelling and a front, side & rear extension following demolition of existing detached garage.

The property is an existing bungalow which will be remodelled to a two storey dwelling. The proposal seeks planning permission to raise the roof height of the original dwelling by 1.9m from 5m to 6.9m including lifting the eaves by 800mm from 2.6m to 3.4m providing accommodation at first floor level. There will be four rooflights to the front elevation.

There will be two front extensions to the property. The two storey front extension to the eastern side of the dwelling will measure 6.8m in width with a length of 6.5m containing a dual pitched roof with a ridge and eave height of 6.9m and 3.4m respectively. There will be a pitched roof dormer inserted to the side roof slope facing the west measuring 2.6metres in height by 2.2metres in width and would project approximately 3metres from the side roof slope equalling 12.54 cubic metres.

The other two storey front extension will measure 1.5m in length with a width of 4.9m containing a dual pitched roof with a ridge and eave height of 6.7m and 3.9m respectively. The western two storey front extension will be sited on the footprint of the existing detached garage which will be demolished.

Also proposed are 2no two storey rear extensions, the extension towards the east of the dwelling will contain a width of 6m and a length of 4.5m and the extension towards the west of the dwelling will contain a width and length of 5.8m and 6.9m respectively. Both extensions contain dual pitched roofs with a ridge and eaves height of 6.9m and 4.4m respectively with Juliet balconies at first floor.

A single storey rear extension is proposed in-filling the gap between the proposed two storey rear extensions and wrapping around the two storey rear extension measuring at a maximum 10metres in length, projecting 3.2metres beyond the rear of the two storey element with a width of 17.6m spanning the full width of the property. The proposal contains a flat roof with an eaves height of 2.8m containing a lantern above.

Other works proposed to the rear is the insertion of one rooflight to the rear roofslope and a rear dormer. The proposed rear dormer would measure 2.6m in height by 2.2m in width projecting off the rear roofslope but will be screened from the adjacent properties by the proposed two storey rear extensions.

The proposed extensions would be constructed using matching brick and tiles. A Planning Support Statement has been submitted accompanying the application and the current proposal have been prepared subsequent to a pre-application submission.

### **SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

The application site is located on the south side of Chester Road in a long and established ribbon of development in Woodford. The host dwelling comprises a detached bungalow with a hipped roof and the area is washed over by Green Belt designation.

The dwelling has been extended in 1993 (J/57828) forming a single storey rear extension. Like the other dwellings on this side of Chester Road, the bungalow is set well back from the frontage to Chester Road behind a landscaped front garden with vehicle access leading to forecourt parking.

The dwelling to the east of the application site, 527 Chester Road, comprises a detached two storey building of larger scale and proportion to the application site with large projecting gables to the rear and dormers to the front elevation. The application property extends beyond this neighbour.

To the west of the application site, 531 Chester Road comprises a two storey detached dwelling of a larger proportions than the application site. This dwelling, however, projects much further to the rear than the application property.

### **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.

#### **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**

ENQ/075994 - 529 Chester Road, Woodford - Proposed extended house with a new dormer roof and rear extension.

J/57828 - 529 Chester Road Woodford - Single storey rear extensions and alterations to garage. Granted. 15.07.1993

## **NEIGHBOUR'S VIEWS**

The owners/occupiers of three surrounding properties were notified in writing of the application. The neighbour notification period expired on the 3<sup>rd</sup> October 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 10<sup>th</sup> February 2021. No letters of representation have been received thus far.

## **CONSULTEE RESPONSES**

Woodford Neighbourhood Forum – In the light of the pre application guidance made by the case officer and quoted in the application documents, we have no objections

## **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 SPD states that a single storey rear extension should project no further than 3 metres along a party boundary close to a habitable room window of a neighbouring property. At the point of 3 metres it may be possible to introduce a 45 degree splay to allow a slightly greater projection. A rear extension must not allow unrestricted views of neighbouring properties. Any side windows, particularly on conservatories should either be obscure glazed, high level or screened by a fence of appropriate height.

New extensions should not impose an unacceptable loss of privacy on the occupants of neighbouring dwellings. An unreasonable loss of privacy will often occur when windows of habitable room windows look into or overlook a principal window belonging to a habitable room of a neighbouring dwelling. A loss of privacy can also occur when windows look into or overlook private gardens belonging to a neighbouring dwelling. Dormer extensions must not result in undue overlooking of a neighbouring property. 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.

Members are advised that the proposed extensions will be located to the south-west of and built approximately 3.4m away from the neighbouring property at 527 Chester Road at its closest point with the application site, the separation increases to 4.6m towards the rear. The resulting property will not extend beyond the existing eastern facing side elevation and therefore the separation distance to 527 Chester Road will remain the same as existing.

The neighbouring property at 527 Chester Road, is a larger scale dormer bungalow which has dormers across the entire front elevation and a gabled two storey rear extension granted in 2015 (DC/057072). The proposed development will be of a similar scale as that of 527 Chester Road.

There are three first floor windows proposed to the side elevation facing this neighbour of which two will serve en-suites and the other serves a bathroom, all the windows will be obscure glazed. There are no additional windows proposed to the side elevation at ground floor. There are three windows to the neighbour's side elevation, one at first floor which is obscure glazed and two non-original ground floor windows which form secondary windows to the lounge.

The procedure of a 45 degree rule is essential in protecting neighbours living conditions against the construction of very large house extensions. It is used to judge whether there would be an overbearing or over-shadowing impact. In this regard, the proposed two storey rear extension will not project beyond a 45-degree angle when measured from the centre point of the nearest first & ground floor clearly glazed habitable room window to the rear elevation at no.527 Chester Road.

The proposed single storey rear extension will contain a flat roof with a maximum height of 2.8m sited approximately 3.2m away from the boundary with no.527. There are no windows proposed to the side elevation facing 527 Chester Road. Given the separation distance combined with the bulk, scale, massing and flat roof of the extension, the proposed single storey rear extension is considered acceptable.

The proposal will be located to the north-east and approximately 1.5m away (at its closest point) from 531 Chester Road. The neighbouring property is set back from the application property. There are two windows proposed in the side elevation of the proposal which will be obscure glazed. There are two windows to the neighbour's side elevation. One at first floor serving a landing and one at ground floor which does not serve a habitable room.

There is a window proposed to the side elevation of the garage and a dormer above however the windows are located approximately 13.6metres away from the side boundary and in any event will overlook the front driveways of both properties (no.529 & no.531). The proposed extensions will not project beyond the rear elevation of this neighbour and therefore it is considered that the proposed works would not result in any unacceptable loss of privacy, light or outlook.

In terms of visual amenity, the resulting dwelling will be 1.9m higher to the ridge level and it is not considered that this increase in height will have an unduly adverse impact upon the amenities afforded from no.527 & no.531 Chester Road given that the resultant ridge height mirrors the ridge of the adjacent neighbour at no.531 Chester Road and is approximately 400mm higher than the neighbour at no.527 Chester Road. As such the proposed development is considered acceptable.

There are no facing properties to the front or rear. 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.

CDH 1.8: Residential Extensions of the UDP Review 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 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.

Extensions which would result in the increased height of a property, through the provision of extra storeys, often raise additional planning concerns to other forms of extension. Their effect on neighbourhood amenity and the street scene is usually more significant. In determining proposals for upward extensions the most satisfactory design solution will depend on the individual character of the property and neighbouring properties. This form of development will normally only be appropriate on detached properties in residential areas of varied design and roof height. Where an upward extension is acceptable in principle, it must respect the established character of the area. The emphasis should be on height, massing, use of materials and roof pitches, which complement both the original house and the locality.

Extensions to the front of a property can often have the greatest visual impact. Front extensions should:



- Leave sufficient space between the extension and the front boundary of the house to retain the appearance of openness around the dwelling.
- Not be obtrusive, prominent features in the streetscene.
- Respect the size and proportions of the existing house.
- Respect the architectural features, brickwork, stonework, colour and texture of the existing house.
- Front porches usually look best where the materials, glazing pattern and degree of roof pitch, match the existing house.
- Where there is a strong building line or an architectural cohesiveness to the street which would be broken, front extensions are unlikely to be acceptable.

A dormer at the rear of the house is usually more acceptable than one at the front as it will be less readily seen by the public. Exceptions may occur where such features are typical of the local area. The SPD confirms that dormers should:

- Be designed to be in proportion to the roof and set into the roof slope so that they are not a dominant feature, small dormers set below the existing ridge line are likely to be more acceptable.
- Have a pitched roof, flat roof dormers added to pitched roofs look out of place and are generally unacceptable.
- Echo the window design and attempt to align vertically with the fenestration below.
- Be constructed from materials to match the existing roof. i.e clad in tiles / slates matching the colour and texture of the existing roof. Dormers clad in UPVC or board are unlikely to be acceptable.
- Dormers should form part of the roof instead of dominating the roof scene

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 features on properties within the surrounding area, therefore the materials proposed are deemed acceptable. The extensions would broadly respect the architecture of the existing dwelling house and the extensions would have a roof matching the existing roofs of neighbouring dwellings. As such, the proposal will appear subservient to the existing dwelling.

The site is positioned at an angle with the adjacent neighbours, therefore it is considered that there is no strong building line or architectural cohesiveness that would be broken as a result of the front extension when viewed from the streetscene, notwithstanding the substantial setback from the highway of 17 metres.

The positioning of the application property and the siting of the extensions at 1.4m off the side boundary with no.527 and 1.5m off the side boundary with no.531 will ensure there is sufficient space between the extension and boundaries of the property which will retain the appearance of openness around the dwelling and no terracing effect will occur. As such it is not considered that the proposal will appear obtrusive or prominent within the streetscene.

Members are advised that there is not a dominant uniform ridge line within the street scene and the adjacent neighbouring property to the south-west at 531 Chester Road has a higher ridge. Submitted with the application and appended to this report is a streetscene plan. This shows that notwithstanding the slight increase in the height of the dwelling, it will not be out of keeping with the pattern of development on this side of Chester Road. The proposed ridge height will be no higher than the existing ridge height of the adjacent neighbour at 531 Chester Road. The proposed ridge height will be approximately 400mm higher than the adjacent neighbour at no.527 Chester Road however it is considered that the proposed ridge height change will not dominate the adjacent neighbouring property. As such the proposed increase in ridge height is considered acceptable and will not be harmful to the character or visual amenities of the streetscene.

The proposed side dormer and rear dormer would not dominate the roof and they wouldn't look out of place in the context of the roof. In addition to this, there are examples of larger dormer extensions within the surrounding area. As such the proposed dormer extensions are considered acceptable.

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 765.34 cubic metres. There is no previous planning history on site for the construction of the garage, therefore the garage has been included in the volume calculations. The existing dwelling has been calculated of having a volume of 856.54 cubic metres however the rear extension 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 874.26 cubic metres which is a 114% 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.
- The character of the area is predominantly of two storey houses that have been extended.

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 considered that there will be limited harm as outlined below.

The permitted development fall-back scheme would have a volume of 749.66 cubic metres which would result in a 97% volume increase of the original dwelling. Whilst this is slightly less than the proposed increase of 114% the permitted development fall-back scheme contains two outbuildings that are not aesthetically pleasing nor complement the existing dwelling and surrounding area. This permitted development scheme of two outbuildings 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 the 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, the proposed extensions would not reduce the gap between the application property and those neighbouring properties to either side. It is noted that there is an existing detached garage on the footprint of the proposed western side/front extension which already limits public views into the undeveloped greenbelt. As such it is not considered that they would have a harmful visual impact upon the Green Belt.

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. It is noted that there are no objections from the Woodford Neighbourhood Forum.

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.

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.

#### 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.

#### 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.

Policy SD-2 of the core strategy states that Planning applications for changes to existing domestic dwellings will be required, where possible and practical, to undertake reasonable improvements to the energy performance of the existing dwelling. An Energy Efficiency Checklist has been submitted in support of the application and as such complies with policy SD-2.

#### 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