

ITEM 1

Application Reference	DC/082791
Location:	32 Aldersgate Road Cheadle Hulme Cheadle SK8 7PJ
PROPOSAL:	Alterations to roof including roof extension, raising of ridge and rooflights. Erection of wraparound side and rear extension. External alterations. Amendments to garage.
Type Of Application:	Householder
Registration Date:	22.09.2021
Expiry Date:	03.12.2021
Case Officer:	Sophie Anderson
Applicant:	Mrs Serena Stabler
Agent:	Mr Deek Watmough

COMMITTEE STATUS

Bramhall & Cheadle Hulme South Area Committee. The application has been referred to Committee due to 8 letters of objection from neighbours and 1 anonymous letter of objection, contrary to the officer recommendation to grant.

DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

The application seeks planning permission for “Alterations to roof including roof extension, raising of ridge and rooflights. Erection of wraparound side and rear extension. External alterations. Amendments to garage.”

The roof would be extended with pitched hipped roofs. The overall height of the dwelling would increase approximately 500mm from approximately 5.7m to approximately 6.2m through the provision of a new roof and the roof pitch would increase from 34 degrees to 42 degrees. The eaves height would match the existing. Rooflights are proposed in the front, side and rear elevations of the roofslope.

The wraparound side and rear extension would be set back approximately 3.0m from the existing front elevation, project out approximately 4.0m from the south side elevation and measure approximately 11.1m in length. The extension would wrap around the existing dwelling, project out approximately 5.7m in depth and measure approximately 13.4m in width. The ridge height would be level with the revised height of the existing dwelling and have a pitched hipped roof. The existing conservatory to the south elevation would be removed.

Other external alterations include the replacement of the existing mono-pitched porch with a dual-pitched open porch. Replacement windows would be inserted in the front, south side and rear elevations and glass doors would be inserted in the south side and rear elevations with

powder coated aluminium frames. Materials would include brick to match existing (as close as possible) and rosemary clay roof tiles.

The existing garage would be retained and amendments made including the removal of the garage doors and the insertion of windows in the front and rear elevations to facilitate its conversion into a home gym.

The existing 1.8m high fencing to the north and east boundaries would be increased in height with the addition of 350mm high timber screening.

The property has off-street parking provision for two vehicles.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The applicant's property is a detached single storey property on a corner plot of a cul-de-sac and dates from the mid-20th century. Vehicular access is gained from Aldersgate Road and there is parking for two vehicles away from the highway. The site is fairly level with no significant change in the gradient in any direction. The property currently comprises of brick, white uPVC windows and concrete tiles to the roof and there is an existing conservatory to the south side. A low brick wall marks the front boundary. There is an existing single detached garage of brick construction. The side boundaries of the front garden are open with the neighbours. Rear boundary treatments comprise timber fencing and mature trees/hedging/vegetation.

The immediate neighbouring properties are detached brick built bungalows similar to this property, some of which have been extended.

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

CDH 1.8: RESIDENTIAL EXTENSIONS

LDF Core Strategy/Development Management policies

SD-2: MAKING IMPROVEMENTS TO EXISTING DWELLINGS

SIE-1: Quality Places

Saved UDP policy CDH1.8 "Residential Extensions"

UDP policy CDH1.8 states that the Council will grant permission for an extension provided that the proposal, amongst other issues, does not cause damage to the amenity of neighbouring properties by reason of overlooking, overshadowing, visual intrusion or loss of privacy.

Core Strategy Policy SIE-1 "Quality Places"

This states that specific account should be had of a number of issues, including provision, maintenance and enhancement of satisfactory levels of privacy and amenity for future, existing and neighbouring users and residents.

Core Strategy Policy SD-2 "Making Improvements to Existing Dwellings"

This policy requires the applicant to submit an "Energy Efficiency Checklist". Policy SD 2 requests that applicants undertaking extensions to residential properties should take reasonable steps, where possible and practical, to improve the energy performance of the existing dwelling.

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 20th July 2021 replaced the previous revisions. 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. It provides a framework within which locally-prepared plans for housing and other development can be produced”*

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. At a very high level, the objective of sustainable development can be summarised as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. At a similarly high level, members of the United Nations – including the United Kingdom – have agreed to pursue the 17 Global Goals for Sustainable Development in the period to 2030. These address social progress, economic well-being and environmental protection”.*

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. 120 (e) states that planning policies and decisions should *“allow upward extensions where the development would be consistent with the prevailing height and form of neighbouring properties and the overall street scene, is well-designed (including complying with any local design policies and standards), and can maintain safe access and egress for occupiers.”*

Para.126 *“The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable 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. Being clear about design expectations, and how these will be tested, is essential for achieving this. So too is effective engagement between applicants, communities, local planning authorities and other interests throughout the process.”*

Para.134 *“. Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes. Conversely, significant weight should be given to:*

a) development which reflects local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes; and/or

b) outstanding or innovative designs which promote high levels of sustainability, or help raise the standard of design more generally in an area, so long as they fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings.”

Para.157 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.219 *“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.

PLANNING HISTORY

DC/012025 - To remove selected branches and crown reduce one oak tree by 30% situated in close proximity to the house.DS/19/53W) – Granted – 13/08/2003

NEIGHBOURS VIEWS

The owners/occupiers of 14 surrounding properties were notified in writing of the application. The neighbour notification period expired on the 22nd October. Eight objections have been received from neighbours and one anonymous letter of objection was received. The main causes of concern are summarised below as;

- The changes are not in keeping with the other properties on Aldersgate Road which are all traditional bungalows;
- The changes would make the property more like a large two storey house than a bungalow and be overbearing to surrounding properties, affecting the nature of the cul-de-sac and potentially devaluing surrounding properties;
- It would significantly increase the footprint of the property, having a negative effect upon surface water drainage and loss of garden impacting wildlife;
- The changes would not complement the existing dwelling in terms of design, scale nor materials and would adversely affect the character of the street scene;
- It would cause damage to the amenity of neighbouring properties by reason of overlooking, overshadowing and visual intrusion;
- It would deprive the property of private garden / amenity space including parking areas;
- It would prejudice similar development by the occupants of neighbouring properties;
- The drive is too short to take more than three vehicles. Inconvenient parking for neighbourhood;
- The property was built in the 1960s – difficult to find matching materials;
- Increased scale – out of proportion, large increase in floor area, visual impact;
- Reduction of off road parking;
- Setting a precedent for other properties on the road to extend on the same scale;
- The increase in footprint by over 100% means the proposal is not subservient to the existing dwelling;
- Loss of privacy and overlooking;
- It is likely that the roof and gutters will over-hang neighbouring gardens;
- Loss of light and shadowing;
- Concerns regarding the protection of trees;
- Encroachment of properties to the east and north;
- Overshadowing and visual intrusion;
- Risk of damage to drain under the garden;
- Height of the roof is at a steeper angle than neighbouring properties;
- Rendering would be out of character; and
- Misrepresentations in the Planning Statement.

Anonymous comments related to:

- Creation of a large family house or take lodgers;
- The drive is too short to take more than three vehicles. Inconvenient parking for neighbourhood;
- The property was built in the 1960s – difficult to find matching materials; and
- The property would look totally out of context on this road.

Amended plans were submitted on 10th November and neighbours were re-notified in writing. The neighbour re-notification period expired on the 25th November. No further comments were received.

CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Arboriculture Officer - The proposed development will have a minimal negative impact on the trees on site and within neighbouring properties. Conditions are recommended to protect trees and ensure protective fencing is in place prior to construction.

ANALYSIS

The site lies within a Predominately Residential Area as identified on the Proposals Map of the SUDP Review. In assessment of the application, it is considered that the main issues of contention are the visual impact of the proposed works, the extension in relation to the existing property, the character and appearance of the area and the potential harm to the amenity of the neighbouring properties.

Design

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.

Policy SIE-1 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).

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.

Para. 6.2 of the SPD states:

“A single storey side extension should respect the form and design of the existing dwelling with a roof design that complements the existing appearance.”

Para. 6.3 of the SPD states:

“Rear extensions are sometimes visible from public areas and may be prominent for neighbours to the side and rear. Wall and roof materials should match those of the existing property. Rear extensions should respect the shape and form of the existing dwelling with a roof design that complements the existing appearance.”

Para. 6.4 of the SPD states:

“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 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.”

Letters of objections from neighbouring properties have raised concerns that the proposals would be too large and would not be in keeping with the surrounding properties and the area.

Amendments have been made to reduce the size of the wraparound side and rear extension, change a cabrio rooflight to standard rooflights, remove render to the elevations, add screening above the existing boundary fencing, change bi-fold doors on the rear elevation to a window and make minor windows changes to the side elevation.

Properties along Aldersgate are detached, brick built bungalows similar to this property, several of which have been altered or extended at roof level with dormers and rooflights. The proposed increase in the overall height of the roof of approximately 500mm is a relatively small increase in height and the increase of the pitch of 8 degrees is also relatively small. There would be no change in the eaves height. The property is located in a corner plot of a cul-de-sac and it is not in a prominent position in the streetscene. The materials including rosemary clay roof tiles are suitable. As such, it is considered that the works to the roof would not look out of character with the existing property or the wider streetscene.

Amendments have been made to reduce the footprint and overall scale of the side and rear wraparound extension. The existing conservatory to the south side elevation would be demolished. Although it is relatively substantial in size, the extension would be set back approximately 3.0m from the front elevation making it subservient in appearance. The existing garage, boundary fencing and corner position of the property would also minimise the visual impact of the extension. The extension would retain a roof form that respects the architecture of the existing property and the wider streetscene.

Amendments have been made to remove proposed render from the elevations. Materials would include brick to match existing (as close as possible), rosemary clay roof tiles and powder coated aluminium frames which are considered appropriate. The sizing and position of the rooflights are suitable.

Other external alterations including the replacement of the existing porch with a pitched roof open porch is modest in scale. Amendments to convert the garage to a home gym are acceptable.

It is considered that the proposed works would respect the design and character of the existing property and the area.

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

Residential Amenity

CDH 1.8: Residential Extensions of the saved UDP states that extensions to residential properties are only permissible where they do not adversely cause damage to the amenity of neighbours by reason of overlooking, overshadowing, visual intrusion or loss of privacy. 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.

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.

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. A rear extension must not allow unrestricted views of neighbouring properties. Any side windows, should either be obscure glazed, high level or screened by a fence of appropriate height.

Letters of objections from neighbouring properties have raised concerns that the proposal would lead to loss of light and loss of privacy.

The extension is single storey and as such the potential for harm to neighbouring properties by overlooking, overshadowing, visual intrusion or loss of privacy is limited.

To the rear, there would be a distance of approximately 1.05m from the north side of the extension to the property boundary with No. 25 Aldersgate. There are no windows proposed in the side elevation of the extension facing this neighbouring property, just a door and a condition would be required to ensure this is obscure glazed. However there are three windows within the facing side elevation of No. 25 Aldersgate. Two of these are obscure glazed and one of these is clear glazed. The clear glazed window does not appear to be a principal habitable room window, just a window serving a non-habitable room / secondary habitable room window. The principal habitable room windows appear to be located on the front and rear elevations and these windows would not be unduly impacted by any aspect of the proposed development. Furthermore, it is considered that the extension wouldn't have a materially harmful impact on the outlook from the clear glazed window within the side elevation of No. 25 Aldersgate to justify refusal of this development. In addition, the existing garage of No. 25 Aldersgate lies along the property boundary and combined with the proposed timber screening atop the existing timber fencing would reduce the impact of the extension on the amenities of this property. Therefore, the impact upon this property is deemed acceptable.

The extension would be adequately separated from properties to the rear including No. 8 Pleasant Way and No. 10 Pleasant Way. The proposed timber screening atop the existing timber fencing on the property boundary would reduce the potential for overlooking.

The extension would retain a distance of approximately 5.4m at its closest point from the property boundary with No. 30 Aldersgate to the south west. The facing side elevation of No. 30 Aldersgate contains two clear glazed windows. The clear glazed windows do not appear to be principal habitable room windows, just windows serving non-habitable rooms / secondary habitable room windows. The principal habitable room windows appear to be located on the front and rear elevations and these windows would not be unduly impacted by any aspect of the proposed development. Furthermore, it is considered that the extension wouldn't have a materially harmful impact on the outlook from the clear glazed windows within the side elevation of No. 30 Aldersgate to justify refusal of this development. In addition, the presence of the existing garage (to be converted to a home gym) together with the boundary fencing and mature planting on the south east property boundary would minimise the impact of the extension on the amenities of this neighbouring property.

Glass windows and doors would be inserted in the south side of the extension however the property has a large garden to the south and there would be a distance of approximately 21.2m from the boundary with properties on Moss Lane (these properties also have relatively large rear gardens). The presence of mature trees and planting on the property boundary to the south would also limit any potential adverse impacts.

The increase in the overall height of the roof of approximately 500mm and the increase of the roof pitch of 8 degrees is considered relatively small and it would not adversely affect the amenity of the neighbouring properties.

The rooflights to the front, sides and rear of the property would not cause undue loss of amenity or privacy to any neighbouring property.

Amendments to convert the garage to a home gym are considered acceptable subject to a condition that no openings are inserted in the south west elevation to prevent overlooking to No. 30 Aldersgate and a condition that the outbuilding is retained in ancillary use to the main property.

As such, it is considered that the proposal 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.

Parking & Highway Safety

The property has two car parking spaces which complies with the Council's adopted parking standards which allows for a maximum of 2 parking spaces per dwelling.

Trees

No works are proposed to the trees on site and the Arboriculture Officer has reviewed the application and confirmed the impact on trees is acceptable subject to recommended conditions.

Other Matters

Concerns were raised that the application would have a negative effect upon surface water drainage and loss of garden impacting wildlife. The property would continue to have a generous sized garden after the extension thereby protecting surface water drainage and wildlife.

Concerns were raised that the roof and gutters would over-hang the boundary fence however confirmation has been provided from the applicant that this would not occur.

Other concerns were raised regarding risk of damage to a drain under the garden, setting a precedent and devaluing house prices however these are not material planning considerations.

SUMMARY

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

The general design of the proposed development is considered acceptable in terms of its relationship to the 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.

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 does comply with the content of these documents.

RECOMMENDATION

Grant subject to conditions.