

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
| <b>Application Reference</b> | <b>DC/076064</b>   |
| <b>Location:</b>             | 92 Styal Road<br>Gatley<br>Cheadle<br>SK8 4JQ  |
| <b>PROPOSAL:</b>             | Proposed increase in ridge height to facilitate a loft conversion, rear dormer roof extension with rear balcony at first floor level and three additional roof lights to the resultant frontage. |
| <b>Type Of Application:</b>  | Householder  |
| <b>Registration Date:</b>    | 19.02.2020   |
| <b>Expiry Date:</b>          | 07.07.2020   |
| <b>Case Officer:</b>         | Mr. Callum Coyne   |
| <b>Applicant:</b>            | Mr. Fiaz Ashraf  |
| <b>Agent:</b>                | Mr. Stephen Starkey  |

### **COMMITTEE STATUS**

Should the Cheadle Area Committee be minded to agree the Officer recommendation to grant planning permission, the application shall be referred to the Planning and Highway Regulation Committee for determination as a Departure from the Development Plan.

### **DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT**

This application seeks planning permission to raise the height of the ridgeline over the central body of the dwelling to accommodate a loft conversion, an internal staircase and the creation of habitable accommodation at first floor level.

The proposal incorporates a rearward first floor projecting dormer with a central flat roofed section enclosed by hipped roofing to each side over part of an existing single storey rear extension. The proposal would create a new master bedroom and en-suite bathroom at first floor with full height bi-fold doors leading from the bedroom onto the balcony positioned above an existing flat roof extension.

When viewed from along Styal Road, or approaching the property from the west via South Road, the proposal would result in a 1.2 metre increase above the ridge of the existing dwelling. The additional size, scale and massing would extend approximately 10 metres in length from north to south, with a maximum rear projection of approximately 7.5 metres to match the depth of the existing outrigger.

The materials proposed would match that of the existing house. In addition, three rooflights are proposed within the roofslope of the property frontage to provide additional daylight to the loft conversion.

### **SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

The application site comprises of a detached bungalow with a large rear garden located to the western side of Styal Road. The site is located within the Green Belt, as identified on the Saved Unitary Development Plan Proposal Map. The western

side of Styal Road is designated as Green Belt however; the north eastern side is situated outside the designated boundary.

The application site is positioned directly opposite the junction with South Drive. To the western rear boundary of the site lies a mature tree belt followed by an area of open pasture land. To the east lie further residential properties extending back to the predominantly residential area of Gatley.

The application site is well screened towards the rear boundary. The rear garden faces due south and therefore shares an angled relationship with adjacent neighbours on both sides. The host dwelling is well set back from the Styal Road frontage behind a mature hedge and gated entrance onto Styal Road. Vehicular access is gained directly from Styal Road with a large driveway and associated parking serving the dwelling.

The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character with residential properties extending in a northerly and southerly direction along Styal Road, most of which are detached bungalows with varied roof designs. A number of two storey dwelling houses are located further south along Styal Road.

The host dwelling, No.92 Styal Road is large detached residential bungalow with a projecting gable to the frontage and a projecting gable to the rear. The property sits within of a row of similar properties occupying the western side of Styal Road. The original house has been previously extended with the erection of a triple bayed flat roofed front extension, which adjoins the pitched roof front outrigger and aligns with the northern side elevation of the bungalow.

A number of properties within the immediate streetscene have been previously extended. The application site is adjoined either side by detached bungalows with wide frontages which fill the width of their respective plots. No. 94 Styal Road (to the south) sits at a higher position and has a corresponding higher ridgeline than that of the application property, whilst no. 90 Styal Road (to the north) has a much larger footprint and is more uniform in layout.

The application site currently benefits from permitted development rights. At the time of the case officer's site visit (in March 2020) building works were taking place which appeared consistent with the recent planning history at the site.

### **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; and

Policies set out in the Stockport Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document adopted 17<sup>th</sup> March 2011.

The relevant policies in the determination of this application are as follows:

### **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

### **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 indicate otherwise.

The NPPF represents the Government's most up-to-date planning policy position, and should be taken into account in plan making and decision taking. 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**

### Application site

Reference: DC/073839; Lawful Development Certificate (Existing); Existing outbuilding within rear garden, the eaves is below 2.5m though the building does sit within the 2m of the boundary. Decision: GRANTED 05-AUG-19

Reference: DC/062637; Lawful Development Certificate (Proposed); Single story extension to rear of existing building. Decision: GRANTED 15-SEP-16

Reference: DC/062748; Lawful Development Certificate (Proposed); Single story outbuilding on land to rear of existing building; Decision: GRANTED 15-SEP-16

Reference: J/56244; Proposed alterations to previously approved extension to increase size of kitchen window and conversion of garage to room. Decision: GRANTED 09-SEP-92

Reference: J/54224; Type: XHS; Address: 92 Styal Road Gatley; Proposal: Single storey side and rear extensions. Decision: GRANTED 07-JAN-92

### No. 96 Styal Road (neighbouring property)

Reference: DC/071947; Proposed increase in ridge height, front and rear dormers, two storey rear extension, rear balcony, new ground floor bay window at the front and front porch. Decision: GRANTED 29-APR-19

## **NEIGHBOUR'S VIEWS**

4 neighbouring properties were consulted by letter on 21<sup>st</sup> February 2020. Further consultation letters were sent on 25<sup>th</sup> February 2020 in order to update the proposal description to ensure that neighbouring occupiers were aware of all aspects of the proposal.

A site notice was displayed by the site on 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2020 and a press notice was published on 27<sup>th</sup> May 2020.

One letter of representation was received during the neighbour consultation period, a general comment, summarised below;

- I have recently received a letter advising me of a change to the plans for the loft conversion at 92 Styal Road however the drawings on the Council's planning portal website seem little (if any) different from the original. Can you advise how much the original ridge height will increase and whether the original planning drawings have changed?

The case officer responded to this query directly via email.

## **CONSULTEE RESPONSES**

Nature Development Officer (Summary) – A bat roost assessment has been carried out and submitted as part of the application. The survey was carried out in June 2020 by a suitably experienced ecologist and followed best practice survey guidelines (Rachel Hacking Ecology Ltd, 2020). An internal and external inspection was undertaken to search for signs of bats and assess the potential for bats to be present. No signs indicative of bat presence were observed during the survey and the building was assessed as offering negligible potential to support roosting bats.

The building was assessed as offering negligible bat roosting potential and so the proposed works are considered to be of low risk to roosting bats.

It is advised that the sensitive working measures detailed in section 4.3 of the bat roost assessment report are followed. This can be secured by condition.

As noted within the Bat Survey submitted, ecological conditions can change overtime and so should works have not commenced within 2 years of the June 2020 survey an update survey may be required to ensure that the ecological impact assessment is based on sufficiently up to date baseline data. This recommendation is outlined in section 4.2 of the bat roost assessment report and can be conditioned if necessary.

If works are proposed during the nesting bird season (which is typically March-August, inclusive), then the following informative should be used [BS42020 D.3.2.2] as part of any planning consent: Trees, scrub, hedges and structures are likely to contain nesting birds between 1st March and 31st August inclusive. Some of these features are present on the application site and are to be assumed to contain nesting birds between the above dates, unless a recent survey has been undertaken by a competent ecologist to assess the nesting bird activity on site during this period and it is absolutely certain that nesting birds are not present.

It is also recommended that an informative is attached to any planning consent granted so that the applicant is aware of the (low) potential for roosting bats to be present. It should also state that the granting of planning permission does not negate the need to abide by the legislation in place to protect biodiversity. If at anytime during works, evidence of roosting bats (or any other protected species such as nesting birds) is discovered on site, works must cease and a suitably experienced ecologist contacted for advice.

Any proposed lighting should be sensitively designed so as to minimise impacts on wildlife associated with light disturbance (following principles outlined in Bat Conservation Trust guidance).

Opportunities for biodiversity enhancements should be sought within the development in line with national and local planning policy. Suitable measures include the provision of bat roosting and/or bird nesting facilities within the roof/on the property.

Recommendation: No objection subject to conditions and informatives.

## **ANALYSIS**

### **Green Belt**

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

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

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

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in 2012 and was updated most recently in 2019. The NPPF sets out the Government's most up to date planning policy position in relation to development in the Green Belt.

The NPPF confirms that inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved other than in 'very special circumstances' (para 143). A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as 'inappropriate' in the Green Belt; exceptions to this are (amongst other matters) the extension and alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building (para 145c).

As per the planning history available, and based upon the figures within the supporting statement, the existing dwelling, as constructed on site currently represents a 59% uplift in volume to the original dwelling.

The proposed development coupled with previous extensions would result in an 81% increase in the volume of the original building (22% beyond that of the existing dwellinghouse). This clearly exceeds the guidance set out above and would result in a disproportionate addition to the original dwelling. The proposed development is therefore inappropriate in the Green Belt and can only be approved in very special circumstances.

In support of their application, the applicant (via a planning consultant) has submitted a planning statement outlining what they consider to be very special circumstances which should be considered as part of this proposal. These can be summarised as follows;

- 1) Application is situated within "ribbon" development;
  - a) Styal Road represents a line of "ribbon" development extending south from Gatley centre. The eastern side of Styal road lies within settlement limits whilst the western side is excluded from the settlement in the Green Belt. Visually however the two sides of Styal Road form part of the same line of continuously developed frontage.
  - b) In such locations it is often considered that a greater amount of development can be accommodated at a residential property without harm to the Green Belt due to the less sensitive setting. Despite the technical Green Belt allocation of the site this is not considered to be an overly sensitive Green Belt location with the property helping forming part of a strong line of built development along the western edge of Styal Road.
  - c) The proposal consists of a roof lift and resultant higher ridge line to only the central section of the dwelling along with a new rear dormer section. The design would closely align and be in keeping with the existing property having a pitched/hipped roof design to the front and sides and utilising matching materials. The proposed extensions are confined within the existing footprint of built development at the site with the main volumetric addition projecting to the rear elevation screened by the existing dwelling when viewed from Styal Road.
  - d) In respect of this "ribbon" development setting the proposal is therefore not considered to have a significant material impact on openness.



- 2) Other similar recent planning approvals within local area;
  - a) Numerous other properties have been extended nearby in the location. The Council's records identify that nos 96, 102, 116 and 118 Styal Road have all successfully been granted planning permission for extensions in excess of 33% justified via similar VSC as those set out in this submission.
  - b) The local planning authority has a duty to be consistent in its decision making. There is nothing noticeably different about the application plot to distinguish it from these other close by sites and therefore no reason for the LPA to act differently and not reach the same conclusion for this proposal. These previous decisions are therefore a material consideration and carry weight in favour of the proposal.
  
- 3) Permitted development fall-back position;
  - a) Initial reference is made to application DC/071618 which approved permitted development for a Larger Home Extension. The works constructed at site (the constructed flat roofed extension) are however significantly less than the quantum of development approved.
  - b) In summary the above scenario grants approval of an additional 89m<sup>3</sup> that has not been executed on site. It is therefore submitted that this quantum should be offset against the development proposed under the current application.
  - c) The above quantum provides a significant proportion (75%) of the additional 119 m<sup>3</sup> proposed under the current application. In addition to the above a simple permitted development single storey side extension could be added to the northern elevation of the existing dwelling. As a minimum, in a flat roofed form, this could provide a further 30.24m<sup>3</sup>.
  - d) The combined result of DC/071618 being implemented as approved and the single storey extension identified above would deliver the same overall cubic content as proposed under this application.
  - e) Furthermore other potential structures which would fall within permitted development rights include a front porch or standard dormer roof extensions
  - f) It should also be noted that the above permitted development scenario could also include for outbuildings under Class E of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Permitted Development) Order 2015 which could be added without planning permission. At present a large outbuilding, or indeed several large outbuildings could be added at the site in addition to the above permitted development scenario.

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

The application site is located within a ribbon of development with a suburban character extending south from Gatley centre. Mature hedges and tree planting lies along the boundaries between the application site and both properties which provide effective screening and privacy.

The proposed extension would represent 81% increase in volume to the original dwelling, however the resulting dwellinghouse would be of a similar size, scale and height to other existing development in the locality. It is considered that the proposal would not obstruct any existing views through the site to the open Green Belt beyond

and will project no further to the rear than other adjacent houses on this side of Styal Road into the open undeveloped areas of the Green Belt.

Members are also advised that planning permission was granted in 2019 to allow the owners/occupiers of No. 96 Styal Road to carry out similar development to that proposed (i.e. the erection of a rearward two storey extension and a proposed increase in ridge height of the original house to facilitate a loft conversion and proposed front and rear dormers and rear balcony). Based upon the case officer's report to the Committee for that application (ref: DC/071947) the recently constructed development represented a 72% volumetric increase to the original dwelling. The renovation works at No. 96 were granted permission on the basis that very special circumstances outweighed any potential harm by reason of inappropriateness.

Furthermore it is noted within the previous case officer's report to the Committee (ref: DC/071947) that a number of properties situated along Styal Road have been significantly extended in the past, some of which have been granted permission for their extensions by the Planning and Highways Regulation Committee in recent years. The examples provided are No.102 Styal Road, No.116 Styal Road and No.118 Styal Road. Other examples have also been included within the applicant's supporting statement.

Notwithstanding the above, each application must be assessed on its own merits. Members are advised that the proposal before them today represents a 22% net increase in volume to the existing dwelling (as currently constructed on site). Furthermore, it is noted that the suburban character and appearance of Styal Road and the surrounding area has significantly changed over the past 15 years and must also be considered as a material planning consideration as part of this assessment.

It is acknowledged that the property benefits from full permitted development rights for the erection of extensions and/or outbuildings. Therefore, modest additions and extensions could be constructed without any control from the Local Planning Authority, for example, extensions to the side and/or front of the dwelling, or detached outbuildings within the rear garden area which, taken individually or cumulatively, could significantly impact the openness of the green belt. Furthermore, a rear dormer window could be added to the existing dwelling under permitted development rights.

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

Notwithstanding the above, given the percentage increase proposed, if planning permission is to be granted, it is recommended that a condition is attached to remove Permitted Development rights in relation to extensions and outbuildings to the dwelling under Schedule 2, Part 1 Classes A, D and E of the General Permitted Development Order. This will afford the Local Planning Authority the opportunity to consider the impact of such extensions upon the Green Belt and the amenities of neighbouring occupiers taking into account the footprint and

rearward projection of the resultant dwelling.

### Design and Appearance

The proposed rear dormer and first floor rear balcony would not be visible from along Styal Road given it would be screened behind the increased ridgeline of the resultant dwellinghouse. Sideward views would be possible from the rear gardens of neighbouring properties however given the host dwelling is set back 15 metres from the front boundary of the site and screened by mature trees, it is considered that these elements would not be widely visible from the streetscene.

Notwithstanding this, the applicant proposes to raise the height of the existing ridge by 1.2 metres. The increase in ridge height would be positioned centrally for a distance of 10 metres with a hipped roof design and would be necessary to incorporate the head height required for a stairwell and the creation of a master bedroom and en-suite within the loft space.

As stated within the supporting planning statement (received 02/06/20) it is acknowledged that the proposed roof extension would be sited centrally within the footprint of the existing dwelling and plot. When viewed from along Styal Road the proposed ridgeline would be positioned higher than the existing however it would remain in keeping with the prevailing roof lines of the immediate streetscene and would be viewed as a continuation of the existing roof pitch.

It is acknowledged that No.94 Styal Road to the south sits at a higher level above the application site with a correspondingly higher ridge line. Therefore it is considered that the proposed works would sit comfortably within the existing street scene. Furthermore, No.93 Styal Road, a neighbouring property located opposite the application site to the north east has a similar roof profile, with an increase in ridge height, positioned centrally, albeit a smaller size.

The proposed increase in ridge height and front roof lights would be visible from along Styal Road, however they would generally respect the form and proportions of the existing dwelling. The proposal would not result in a significant adverse impact upon the character or appearance of the host dwelling. Similarly, the resultant dwelling would not create a prominent feature within the streetscene, or be out of keeping with the existing streetscene or the wider character and appearance of the area.

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

### Neighbour Amenity

As stated within the supporting planning statement, the application site is bound by residential development on either side, with No.94 Styal Road to the south and No.90 Styal Road to the north. It is considered that both properties are generally well separated, orientated and sited in respect of the location of the proposed works and would remain largely unaffected by the proposed works as a result of being set within their own spacious plots.

Based upon the plans submitted (received 19/02/20) it is considered that the proposed increase in ridge height of the existing dwellinghouse and rear dormer extension to facilitate a loft conversion would not cause significant harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring properties due to overshadowing, overbearance, loss of light or loss of outlook to adjacent neighbours.

Notwithstanding this, the applicant also proposes to incorporate a first floor rear balcony with bi-folding doors leading out onto the resultant flat roof rear extension which would provide an opportunity for sideward views towards neighbouring houses and private rear garden areas.

Therefore, in order to protect the future relationship with both No.90 and No.94 Styal Road and restrict any loss of privacy or visual intrusion on both sides, if permission is to be granted, a condition is recommended to ensure that solid privacy screens will be installed along both the northern and southern sides of the proposed first floor rear balcony, at a minimum height of 1.8 metres above the finished floor level and shall be retained at all times thereafter.

Furthermore, it is noted that no letters of objection have been received during the neighbour consultation period.

Subject to a screening condition (as detailed above) it is considered that the proposal would not cause damage to the amenity of neighbouring properties due to overlooking, overshadowing, visual intrusion, or loss of privacy and would not unduly deprive the property to be extended of private garden or amenity space including parking areas. Furthermore, the proposal would not prejudice similar development by the occupants of neighbouring properties.

The proposal therefore accords with saved policy CDH1.8 of the Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review, policy SIE-1 the adopted Stockport Core Strategy DPD the guidelines set out in the 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

### Ecology

Many buildings have the potential to support roosting bats. In addition, the application site is located amid suitable bat foraging habitat, which increases the likelihood of bats being present within the application site. The Council's Nature Development Officer was formally consulted as part of this application and raised no objection to the proposal, subject to planning conditions relating to sensitive working as detailed within section 4.3 of the bat survey.

Furthermore the Council's Nature Development Officer has identified the need for an additional ecological impact assessment to be secured by condition should works not commence on site within 2 years of the June 2020 as detailed within section 4.2 of the daytime bat survey (Rachel Hacking Ecology).

As summarised within the 'Consultee Responses' section of this report, the Council's Nature Development Officer has also recommended that informatives be attached to any decision notice with regards potential for bat roosting, protected species, wild birds and biodiversity.

On this basis, subject to conditions and informatives to ensure that the applicant is aware of the nesting season and the potential for bats to be present on site, the proposal is considered in accordance with policy SIE-3 the adopted Stockport Core Strategy DPD, the guidelines set out in the 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' SPD and the revised National Planning Policy Framework.

#### Other Issues

Following the submission of additional site photographs by the applicant (received 22/05/20) it is noted that certain elements have recently been constructed on site i.e. the proposed raised patio area. These are not referred to on the application form, supporting statement or indeed any of the existing or proposed drawings attached to this application.

The assessment above relates to the proposed loft conversion, increase in ridge height, rear dormer roof extension and first floor rear balcony only. For clarity, Members are advised that the existing raised patio/retaining wall element is not included within the description of the proposal submitted and therefore, based upon the application submission, does not form part of this application.

The applicant should satisfy themselves that the development is lawful, or apply for retrospective planning permission in order to avoid potential enforcement action.

Officers note that it appears that additional works have been conducted between 15<sup>th</sup> March 2020 and 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2020, which seems to differ from the aerial photographs available to the case officer at present. The applicant has stated verbally that the raised patio area previously existed and is currently being reinforced on site with a retaining wall as part of ongoing works to the recently constructed single storey rear extension.

#### Conclusions

The application site comprises of a detached bungalow with a large rear garden located within the Green Belt, as identified on the Saved Unitary Development Plan Proposal Map.

The proposal represents a volume increase of approximately 81% over the original dwelling and the proposal is therefore considered a departure from the Council's Development Plan and Para 145 of the NPPF. Whilst the proposal constitutes inappropriate development, it is considered that the case for very special circumstances is sufficient to outweigh harm by reason of inappropriateness.

Furthermore, it is noted that the proposal represents a 22% net increase in volume to the existing dwelling (as currently constructed on site).

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, as well as the guidelines set out in the 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' SPD, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

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

SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

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

Furthermore, it is also noted that no letters of objection were received during the neighbourhood consultation period.

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.

Should the Cheadle Area Committee be minded to agree the Officer recommendation to grant planning permission, the application shall be referred to the Planning and Highway Regulation Committee for determination as a Departure from the Development Plan.

**CHEADLE AREA COMMITTEE 21<sup>ST</sup> JULY 2020**

The Planning Officer introduced the application. Members considered the report and agreed the recommendation.