

MARPLE AREA COMMITTEE (21/04/2021)

The Planning Officer introduced the application and highlighted the pertinent issues of the proposal.

Members sought clarification with regard to flooding and drainage management, in view of existing drainage issues in the area. The Planning Officer highlighted relevant policies in relation to control of surface water drainage from developments and confirmed that an appropriate surface water drainage scheme would be controlled by condition. Members sought confirmation as to whether or not the site was located within a Conservation Area. The Planning Officer confirmed that the site was not located within a Conservation Area. Members sought further clarification with regard to surface water drainage, due to the fact that existing drains in the area are not mapped. The Planning Officer highlighted the comments received to the application from United Utilities, explained the SUDS hierarchy for surface water drainage and confirmed that surface water drainage would be controlled by condition, in consultation with the Council Lead Local Flood Authority and in accordance with relevant policies and the NPPF/NPPG for such a minor development, comprising a replacement dwelling. Members sought clarification with regard to access to the site off the narrow bridleway in terms of health and safety and fire safety. The Planning Officer acknowledged the existing narrow access, however highlighted that the proposal comprised a replacement dwelling, with no increase in the number of dwellings at the site. As recommended by the Highway Engineer, demolition and construction would be appropriately controlled by way of condition. The Planning Officer confirmed that any fire safety issues would be controlled by way of the Building Regulations. Members sought clarification as to whether or not permitted development rights would be removed. The Planning Officer confirmed that usual householder permitted development rights would be removed by condition. Members sought clarification as to why Core Strategy DPD policies H-2, CS2, CS3 and CS4 were not relevant to the proposal. The Planning Officer confirmed that such policies were not relevant due to the fact that the proposal comprised a replacement dwelling, rather than a new/additional dwelling.

There were no requests to speak in objection to the application.

The applicant spoke in support of the application. The applicant acknowledged the detailed report and was happy to answer any Member questions. In terms of access and parking, it was confirmed that construction access would not be taken via the public footpath and arrangements had been made for access to the site by alternative means, ensuring that the footpath would not be blocked and would not need to be temporarily closed. In terms of parking during construction and following development, arrangements had been for parking on private land, which would not affect either Gird Lane or Mill Brow.

Members sought clarification from the applicant as to whether or not drainage had been considered and if discussions had taken place with United Utilities. The

applicant confirmed that a full drainage design would be produced should planning permission be granted, which United Utilities would be consulted on and taking into account relevant regulations.

Members debated the proposal. Whilst the size of the proposed replacement dwelling was noted, it was considered that the Officer recommendation to grant should be followed in this particular case.

Following the debate, it was agreed by all Members to refer the application to the Planning and Highways Regulation Committee for determination with a recommendation to grant.