

Application Reference	DC/081751
Location:	5 Roseway Bramhall Stockport SK7 3BQ
PROPOSAL:	Replacement roof including raising ridge height, gable end to rear and loft conversion. Single storey extension and canopy to rear of property.
Type Of Application:	Householder
Registration Date:	01.07.2021
Expiry Date:	31.01.2022
Case Officer:	Sophie Anderson
Applicant:	Ms Michelle Snee
Agent:	Mr Andy Wilde

UPDATE

Members will recall that this application was considered at the meeting of the Area Committee on 2nd December 2021. Having heard representations from the neighbour at that meeting Members agreed that the further consideration of the application be deferred to this meeting so to allow for the neighbours to be re-notified of the amended plans.

Members are advised that as requested, letters were sent to the neighbours on 3rd December 2021. The application is therefore represented to Members for consideration.

Since the application was last considered by Members, the applicant has engaged a Planning Consultant to act on their behalf. Further information has been submitted on behalf of the applicant relating to:-

- Permitted Development Fallback Position;
- Site Photographs;
- Boundary Treatments;
- Neighbour Objections;
- Planning Conditions; and
- Other Matters.

In particular, the report highlights the need for the development which is to enable the applicant's son, who has assisted needs, to live as independently as possible in a property that is near to his family and support network. The application would enable the applicant's son to move out of a social care apartment that does not cater for his needs, into a home whereby he has the space, care and family nearby.

These issues are discussed in the report below.

COMMITTEE STATUS

Area Committee – 4 or more representations contrary to the Officer recommendation.

DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

The application seeks planning permission for *“Replacement roof including raising ridge height, gable end to rear and loft conversion. Single storey extension and canopy to rear of property. External alterations. Extension of dropped kerb and parking.”*

The overall height of the dwelling would increase by approximately 0.75m, from 5.69m to 6.44m through the provision of a new roof. The eaves height would increase by approximately 0.405m, from 2.595m to 3.0m. The roof pitch would increase by approximately 3 degrees from 32 degrees to 35 degrees. A window is proposed in the south (rear) elevation of the gable end at first floor level and rooflights are proposed in the north (front) and west (side) elevations of the roof over the existing dwelling and in the roof of the single storey rear extension.

The rear extension would extend 2.995m from the original rear elevation of the property, it would measure 3.963m in width with a flat roof approximately 3m high. The flat roof would extend across the width of the rear of the building creating a roof canopy covering an area of deck.

Other external alterations would include the removal of the existing utility room to the east side elevation, the removal of the existing porch to the front elevation and the insertion of a small window in the gable end to the front of the property. Replacement windows would be inserted in the north (front), east (side) and rear (south) elevations and glass doors would be inserted in the east (side), west (side) and rear (south) elevations with black UPVC frames.

The existing property and extension would be rendered with a white and grey finish with slate roof tiles. Metal roof cladding would also be used to the rear.

To the front of the property the existing hedging would be replaced with low planting or fencing, there would be parking spaces for three vehicles and the dropped kerb would be extended to 5.5m in width.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application property is a detached single storey dwelling and dates from the mid-20th century. Vehicular access is gained from Roseway 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. Existing extensions include a single storey side extension and a flat roofed porch to the front elevation.

The immediate neighbouring properties are detached brick built bungalows similar to this property, some of which have been extended and there are a mix of materials (brick and render).

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

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

No previous planning history.

NEIGHBOURS VIEWS

The owners/occupiers of 8 surrounding properties were notified in writing of the application. The neighbour notification period expired on the 30th July. Four objections were received. The main causes of concern are summarised below as;

- The raised roof would be out of character with other properties on Roseway and would spoil the aesthetic appeal of the neighbourhood;
- The forward facing rooflight would affect privacy;
- The level and volume of construction will enormously impact nearby residents and parking issues during construction;
- The raised roof would reduce light to our property / the cul de sac;
- Parking for 3 cars would spoil the look and appeal for Roseway;
- The rear of No. 5 is further back to the rear. The new wall and gable end roof will affect our sunlight; and
- The property may look like a house not a bungalow.

Amended plans were submitted on 30th September, the surrounding properties were re-notified in writing and the re-notification period expired on 26th October. A further three comments were received (two from the same properties as the original objections) citing the same concerns as previously mentioned and concerns regarding;

- Loss of natural light contrary to The Right of Light Act 1959 (ROLA 1959) and overshadowing to neighbouring properties.

Further plans were submitted on and after 5th November. Surrounding properties were not formally re-consulted on these amended plans as they provided further details and clarification rather than making significant amendments to the proposal. A further 3 comments were received after 26th October (from the same properties as the original objections) raising the same concerns as previously mentioned and concerns regarding;

- Differences in the originally submitted existing elevations and the amended existing elevations;

- Misinformation and lack of opportunity to comment on the amended plans;
- Queries regarding the overall height of the roof and eaves.

At the Committee meeting on 2nd December 2021, as there was some ambiguity regarding the plans, the application was deferred until the January Committee meeting and all the neighbours were re-consulted on 3rd December. A further two comments were received (from the same properties as the original objections) raising the same concerns as previously mentioned.

CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Highway Engineer - No objections to amended plans subject to a condition relating to pedestrian visibility splays.

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 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. 6.3 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.”

Para. 6.5 of the SPD states:

“Where planning permission is required for a hip to gable roof extension, this is unlikely to be appropriate in areas where hipped roofs predominate due to the adverse impact on the street scene this may cause.”

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 the scheme to reduce the floor height and to reduce the height and pitch of the roof.

Properties along Roseway are detached, brick built bungalows similar to this property, some of which have been extended and there are a mix of materials (brick and render). Several neighbouring properties have been altered or extended at roof level. For example, the neighbouring property to the east, 3 Roseway, has a dormer window to the front elevation (Planning Ref: DC/028776) and 10 Roseway has had roof alterations (Planning Ref: DC/026384). The proposed increase in the overall height of the roof of approximately 0.75m, from 5.69m to 6.44m, and the increase of the eaves height of approximately 0.405m, from 2.595m to 3.0m is a relatively small increase in height which would not look out of character with the existing property or the wider streetscene. The rooflight to be inserted in the front roofslope and the small window to be inserted in the gable end to the front of the property are considered appropriate in terms of their size and position. The hip to gable roof extension would be to the rear of the property and it would not have an adverse impact on the street scene.

The existing property and extension would have a white rendered finish to the upper portion with a grey rendered finish to the lower portion. It is noted that other neighbouring properties are rendered including 1, 3, 7 and 8 Roseway and this would not be out of keeping with the streetscene. The black UPVC window frames and slate roof tiles are considered appropriate.

The rear extension would extend 2.995m from the original rear elevation of the property. It would be a distance of approximately 1m from the property boundary with No. 3 to the east and the covered canopy area would be a distance of approximately 1.2m from the property boundary with No. 7 to the west. The flat roof is noted, however it would be subservient to the existing dwelling, sited to the rear elevation and not readily visible from public vantage points.

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. The Council's SPD advises that there should be a minimum of 25m between habitable rooms windows on the private side of dwellings. 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.

There is a distance of approximately 1m at its closest point from the east side elevation of the existing property and the property boundary with 3 Roseway. A condition was suggested previously that the glass door and window proposed in the east side elevation of the existing property facing 3 Roseway be obscure glazed, however, the applicant has pointed out that as the proposed door and window is to be sited in the existing dwelling and can be carried out under Permitted Development (without the need for planning permission nor fettered by conditions) it is not reasonable to require these to be obscure glazed. The applicant has also pointed out that there is timber fencing 2.1m high and thick vegetation between the application property and 3 Roseway which would limit opportunities for overlooking or loss of privacy to this

property. This argument is accepted and noting that this element of the proposal could be carried out without planning permission irrespective of the consideration of this application, Members are advised that it would be unreasonable to control the glazing of this door and window. The rear extension would not project more than 3m in depth which is in full compliance with the guideline for extensions in such locations as found in the SPD. As such, the proposal would not be overbearing or cause any undue loss of light, outlook or general amenity to this property.

There is a distance of approximately 1.4m between the west side elevation of the proposed roof canopy and the property boundary with 7 Roseway. Rooflights are proposed in the side elevation of the existing property however these would not result in any overlooking. Glass doors are proposed in the west side elevation of the extension facing No. 7 however there would be a distance of approximately 5.55m between the side elevation of the rear extension and the property boundary and this is considered acceptable. The rear extension and roof canopy would not project more than 3m in depth which is in full compliance with the guideline for extensions in such locations as found in the SPD. As such, the proposal would not be overbearing or cause any undue loss of light, outlook or general amenity to this property.

The increase in the overall height of the roof of 0.75m and the increase in the eaves height of 0.405m is not considered to adversely affect the amenity of any of the neighbouring properties.

There would be a separation distance of approximately 32m between the rear of the extended dwelling at first floor level and the property to the rear, 13 Broadoak Road, this exceeds the Council's separation distance of a minimum of 25m between habitable rooms windows on the private side of dwellings. As such, the proposal would not cause an unacceptable loss of privacy or outlook to this neighbouring property.

The rooflights to the front, rear and west of the property would not cause undue loss of amenity or privacy to any neighbouring 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 Council's adopted parking standards allows for a maximum of 2 parking spaces per dwelling. The proposed development would increase the existing parking provision which accommodates 2 vehicles to provision for 3 vehicles and increase the length of the dropped kerb to 5.5m. The area forward of principal elevation is already hard surfaced and the Council's Highways Officer has no objections to the amended plans subject to a condition relating to pedestrian visibility splays.

Other Matters

Concerns regarding the level and volume of construction are applicable to any building works and are not a justification for an objection.

A summary of the further information submitted from the Planning Consultant is included below:

Permitted Development would enable:

- The installation of a kitchen door and window in the east elevation of the existing dwellinghouse;
- The erection of a single storey rear extension with a rearwards projection of up to 4m;
- The alteration of the existing roof (notwithstanding raising the ridge) from a hip to gable; and
- The installation of rooflights.

Members are advised that the applicant is correct that these works are a Permitted Development Fallback which is a material consideration in the assessment of this application. The Permitted Development Fallback does carry some weight and Members are advised accordingly:-

- The applicant is free to insert as many doors or windows into the external elevations as they choose without the need for planning permission. In this instance the Council would have no control over the glazing of these openings.

- A 4m deep single storey rear extension constructed under Permitted Development can only be 4m in height. Whilst such an extension may be deeper in terms of its projection that that proposed by this application it would be lower in height. Notwithstanding that, the Council would have no control over the form and appearance of such an extension (other than its height and depth) and which would be aesthetically less pleasing than that proposed by this application.

- The applicant could under Permitted Development extend the side roof slopes of the main roof such that they would rise vertically to a point level with the existing 5.9m high ridge from the existing side elevations. Whilst slightly lower in height to that proposed (0.75m) the resulting roof form would be significantly bulkier than that proposed and would be likely to have a greater impact not only on the streetscene but the amenities of the neighbouring properties also (noting their objections to that existing).

- The applicant could under Permitted Development insert as many rooflights as they choose not only into the existing roofspace but also into any roofspace created under the rights that would enable them to extend the roofspace (as referred to above). Noting that neighbours object to that currently proposed which includes only 1 new rooflight to the front elevation, 2 new rooflights to the side elevation and a new casement window to the rear elevation, that possible under Permitted Development could have a much greater impact.

Members need to consider the fallback position afforded by Permitted Development rights in their assessment of the proposed development. In terms of the weight that should be attached to the ability to extend and alter the existing dwelling under Permitted Development, Members are advised that given the relatively small increase in the height of the dwelling proposed by this application together with the limited depth of the rear extension, the works permissible under Permitted Development could have a similar if not greater impact. As such, substantial weight should be afforded to this consideration.

The applicant has made references to the existing boundary treatments including:

- Between 3 and 5 Roseway – A fence measuring at least 2.15m high and thick vegetation;
- Between 5 and 7 Roseway - A timber fencing measuring approximately 2.1m high and dense vegetation / mature trees;
- Substantial mature planting in the form of trees and shrubs along the eastern, southern and western boundaries of the site which exceeds the height of the fence panels that run along the boundaries of 3 and 7 Roseway.



Photograph 1: The view towards no.3 Roseway from rear garden (ABL Planning & Development, 6th January 2022)



Photograph 2: The view towards no.7 Roseway from rear garden (ABL Planning & Development, 6th January 2022)

It is agreed that there are significant boundary treatments between the application property and the neighbouring properties that if retained would reduce the impact of the proposed development particularly in relation to loss of light, overlooking or loss of privacy to these properties. It is accepted that the removal of the existing landscaping on the boundaries could be removed without the need for the consent of this Authority but even if this were to occur, noting that rear gardens are usually enclosed by 2m high fencing (to protect privacy) such boundary treatments would still assist in reducing the impacts of the proposed development.

The applicant has responded to a number of objections in respect of:

- The raised roof would be out of character with the other properties on Roseway and would spoil the aesthetic appeal of the neighbourhood;
- The forward facing roof light would affect privacy;
- The level and volume of construction will enormously impact nearby residents and parking issues during construction;
- Parking for 3 cars would spoil the look and appeal of Roseway;
- The raised roof would reduce light to our property / the cul de sac. The rear of no.5 is further back to the rear. The new wall and gable end roof will affect our sunlight;
- The property may look like a house and not a bungalow.

These issues have already been address in the report above.

As stated above, the report highlights the need for the development which is to enable the applicant's son, who has assisted needs, to live as independently as possible in a property that is near to his family and support network. The application would enable the applicant's son to move out of a social care apartment that does not cater for his needs, into a home whereby he has the space, care and family nearby. Members are advised that the personal circumstances rarely justify the need for development especially used to justify otherwise unacceptable development as the adverse impacts of such development would remain long after the particular need for the development ceases to exist. As such planning applications should be determined on planning grounds alone supported by development plan policies.

Notwithstanding this, and noting that in the view of Officers, the proposed development is not unacceptable and complies with development plan policies, this information is simply noted.

The applicant has submitted a Construction Management Plan (CMP) as part of the proposals which sets out how the construction of the development will be managed in terms of hours of construction works, use of plant and machinery, dust control, parking by contractors, waste and welfare. Members are advised that the imposition of a condition to ensure compliance with such a document should not be undertaken as a matter of course noting that the application should be determined having regard to the impacts of the completed development rather than construction works. It is also noted that elements of the CMP such as noise, hours of operation and dust control are controlled in any event by Environmental Health legislation. It is also noted that the application property benefits from off street parking and has unfettered access to the public highway where there is ample room for contractors and delivery vehicles to park. As such in this instance it is not considered that the imposition of a condition requiring compliance with the CMP are justified. An informative could however be imposed seeking compliance with this document and reminding the applicant of the need to carry out the construction of the development in a considerate manner.

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 Permitted Development fallback, the Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings SPD and the NPPF have also been considered and the recommendation of Officers to grant planning permission remains the same as that previously advised.

RECOMMENDATION

Grant subject to conditions.

BRAMHALL & CHEADLE HULME SOUTH AREA COMMITTEE 2ND DECEMBER 2021

The Planning Officer introduced the application and advised Members that the Right to Light is a civil matter and is not a matter to be considered as part of the planning application. Cllr Bagnall asked if a Construction Management Plan would be considered as the road is quite tight and the Planning Officer agreed that it would be appropriate to secure this via a condition.

An objector spoke against the application.

Concerns were raised that the plans had been altered and residents hadn't been informed. The Planning Officer advised that the second amendment was a correction to the existing plans. As originally submitted the existing eaves height was 2.5m and on the corrected existing plan the eaves height was 2.595m, which is a difference of only 4.5cm. The reference to 2.7m on the plan relates to the first floor level, not the eaves height. The proposed eaves height is 3m. Residents were notified of the amendments to the proposed development however they weren't notified of corrections to the existing plans because a difference of 4.5cm is not a significant amendment and not something that we would usually notify residents of.

Cllr Bagnall suggested that as there appeared to be some discrepancy that the application be deferred to get some clarity. Members agreed that there was some ambiguity, the application be deferred until the January Committee meeting and all the neighbours be re-consulted.