

ITEM 1

Application Reference	DC/083165
Location:	16 Seal Road Bramhall Stockport SK7 2JR
PROPOSAL:	Alterations to existing roof including raising of ridge. Extension to rear elevation. Extension to garage and new porch to front elevation. Rendering of property.
Type Of Application:	Householder
Registration Date:	25.10.2021
Expiry Date:	31.01.2022
Case Officer:	Sophie Anderson
Applicant:	Mrs Denise Green
Agent:	Mr Derek Watmough

COMMITTEE STATUS

Bramhall & Cheadle Hulme South Area Committee. The application has been referred to Area Committee due to 5 representations contrary to the officer recommendation to grant.

DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

The application seeks planning permission for alterations to the existing roof including the raising of the ridge, an extension to the rear elevation, an extension to the garage and new porch to the front elevation and rendering of the property. This application proposes amendments to the previously approved permission (DC/081610) including an extension to the rear of the proposed roof.

As with that previously approved the proposed roof would increase in height from approximately 4.9m to 5.9m. This proposal however differs from the previously approved application in that it would remove the central flat-roofed dormer, Juliet balcony and lower hipped elements and extend the enlarged roof to the rear of the property to create a 4 bedroom (rather than a 3 bedroom) dwelling. Additional rooflights are proposed in the side and rear elevations of the roofslope.

Other elements of the proposal which are the same as that approved by DC/081610 are detailed below:

The existing rear extensions would be demolished and the proposed rear extension would extend 6.65m from the original rear elevation of the property, it would run the full width of the property (14.3m) with a flat roof to the centre and two hipped elements either side measuring up to approximately 4.5m high. Glass doors and windows would be inserted in the rear elevation.

To the front elevation the garage would be extended 1m forward and the roof changed from a flat roof to a pitched roof with a forward facing gable end measuring approximately 4.4m in height. A new open porch would be erected measuring 1m in depth, 2.3m in width and 3.9m in height.

Two windows and a door would be inserted in the south east (side) elevation of the property.

The existing property and extension would also be rendered with a white rendered finish.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The applicant's property is a detached single storey property and dates from the mid-20th century. Vehicular access is gained from Seal 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. Existing extensions include a flat roofed garage and flat roofed rear extensions.

The immediate neighbouring properties are mostly detached brick built bungalows similar to this property. The wider street scene is more varied, with two storey properties to the east of the site and 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

DC/081610 - Alterations to existing roof including raising of ridge and erection of rear dormer. Extension to rear elevation. Extension to garage and new porch to front elevation. Rendering of property (Resubmission of DC/080521) – Approved – 25/10/2021

DC/080521 - Proposal: Extending the garage and new porch to the front elevation. Extending the rear elevation. New slightly raised roof to allow residential space within the roof with an inverted balcony to the rear – Withdrawn - 22/06/2021

J/4809 - Proposal: Porch/garden store – Granted – 13/01/1976

J/1017 - Proposal: Kitchen extension – Granted – 02/10/1974

NEIGHBOURS VIEWS

The owners/occupiers of 8 surrounding properties were notified in writing of the application. The neighbour notification period expired on the 19th November 2021.

To date, 5 representations have been received from stated addresses including 5 objections.

The main causes of concern are summarised below as;

- The application brings the upper floor closer, and hence the windows. It increases the number of bedrooms, windows and consequently [gives] residents a view into our property, and from a greater elevation. It will be detrimental to our privacy, and to a certain extent our wellbeing. There will be a clear view from the upper floor rooms into our dwelling;
- The erosion of bungalows after their conversion into 3 and 4 bedroom houses. I respectfully suggest that this type of property conversion should be brought under control

if the Council is to ensure that their Strategic Housing Plan provides diversity of property types for all age groups. Surely there is already a significant supply of purpose built family homes without reducing the stock of bungalows that are in short supply and high demand;

- The plans for 4 bedrooms upstairs by increasing the ridge height of the roof makes the building dominant and overbearing to the neighbours;
- It might appear that No. 14 had the roof raised, but it has not;
- There is a loss of privacy to the neighbours as they will be overlooked due to the close proximity and height;
- The structure is out of character for the neighbourhood;
- Why has this application be submitted immediately after obtaining planning permission for DC/081610, which seems to resemble the very first plans DC/081521 which the owners themselves withdrew? These [plans for DC/081521] were withdrawn due to comments received from the Planning Department;
- The property will overshadow No. 14 and from the back will be overbearing and not in keeping with surrounding properties;
- It looks like there will be overhang from the roof which then encroaches over No. 14's boundary;
- Concern over spoiling of garden space for neighbouring disabled residents; and
- It would have an overbearing effect on the bungalow each side, it does not conform to the rest of the bungalows situated on Seal Road.

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. 6.4 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.

Properties along Seal Road are all detached, are of various styles and designs and there is a mix of one and two storey dwellinghouses. The increase in the roof height to the front of the property from approximately 4.9m to 5.9m and changes to the front roofslope were considered to not look out of character with the existing property or the wider streetscene and have been established as part of the previously approved application (DC/081610). As with the previously approved application, the eaves height of the property would not be increased.

Although the proposal would increase the scale and massing of the rear roof slope, the amendments from the previously approved application would be to the rear of the property and would not readily be visible from public vantage points. It is considered that the proposal would have an acceptable design and materials would match existing. Additional rooflights would be inserted in the side and rear roof slopes and these are considered appropriate in terms of their size and position.

An assessment of the other elements of the development proposed which are the same as that approved by DC/081610 are detailed below:

Changes to the front elevation include the replacement of the flat roof of the garage and the erection of the open porch. The pitched roof of the garage is preferable in design terms to the existing flat roof and it is noted that neighbouring properties No. 14 Seal Road and No. 12 Seal

Road have made amendments to have a pitched garage roof. The open porch would replace the existing porch and is modest in scale. The works to the garage and porch would be subservient to the host dwelling and respect the architecture of the host dwelling and the wider streetscene.

The existing property and extension would have a white rendered finish. It is noted that other neighbouring properties are rendered including No. 11, 17, 19 and 21 Seal Road and this would not be out of keeping with the streetscene.

The existing rear extensions would be demolished and the proposed rear extension would extend 6.65m from the original rear elevation of the property. The extension would be erected along the property boundary with No. 14 Seal Road to the north west and would be a distance of approximately 1m from the side elevation of the property boundary with No. 18 Seal Road to the south east. Although relatively substantial in size, this projection is less than the 8m distance allowable under permitted development (subject to prior approval). It would have an acceptable design and it would be subservient to the existing dwelling on account of its reduced height. It would be sited to the rear elevation and not readily visible from public vantage points.

It is considered that the proposed works would be in proportion with the main dwelling and would not be out of character with 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.

Roof extensions must not result in undue overlooking of a neighbouring property. Extensions which cause an unacceptable loss of privacy or outlook to neighbouring properties, or look out of keeping with the character of the street, will be refused.

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

An additional rooflight is proposed in the side elevation facing the neighbouring property to the south east, No. 18 Seal Road however it is not considered that this would lead to a significant loss of privacy as there are no original, principle, habitable room windows to the side elevation of this neighbouring property. The rear elevation of this neighbouring property has been extended with a conservatory however as it is not original it is not afforded amenity protection

as per guidance in the Supplementary Planning Document. There would a distance of approximately 1m from the side elevation of the property to the boundary with No. 18 Seal Road and the proposed rear extension like that previously approved would not project more than 3m past the existing conservatory; this is in full compliance with the guideline for extensions in such locations as found in the SPD. As such, it is not considered that the increase in height or scale of the rear roofslope would be overbearing or cause any undue loss of light, outlook or general amenity to this property.

An additional rooflight is also proposed in the side elevation facing the neighbouring property to the north west, No. 14 Seal Road however it is not considered that this would lead to a significant loss of privacy. No windows are proposed in the side elevation facing this neighbouring property and there are no original, principle, habitable room windows to the side elevation of No. 14 Seal Road. The rear elevation of No. 14 Seal Road has been extended however as the extension is not original it is not afforded amenity protection as per guidance in the Supplementary Planning Document. As with the rear extension previously approved on the application property, that proposed would not project more than 3m past the existing extension on this neighbouring property; this is in full compliance with the guidelines for extensions in such locations as found in the SPD. As such, it is not considered that the increase in height or scale of the rear roofslope would be overbearing or cause any undue loss of light, outlook or general amenity to this property.

The property has a large rear garden and there would be a large separation distance of approximately 37.8m between the rear of the extended dwelling and the property boundary with properties to the rear on Colwyn Road. There would also be a distance of at least 9m from the rear of the extended property to the property boundary with No. 13 Ashness Drive to the south west. This complies with and exceeds the requirement of 6m to the boundary as set out in the SPD. As such, the proposal would not cause an unacceptable loss of privacy or outlook to neighbouring properties or properties to the rear.

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.

Other Matters

Concerns were raised that the application would change the property from a bungalow to a house and that bungalows for the elderly are scarce in the area. National planning policy enables homeowners to adapt and extend their property including making an upward extension to their property. A shortage of bungalows in the area to meet demand is not relevant to this application as there are no policies in the Development Plan that seek to resist the loss of bungalows.

A comment was made that No. 14 Seal Road had not had the roof raised. This is noted and references to this previously made in connection with the approved development have been removed from this report.

Concerns were raised that this application was submitted immediately after obtaining planning permission for DC/081610 and that the plans for this application seem to resemble the very first plans DC/080521 which the owners themselves withdrew. Members are advised that an applicant can generally submit as many planning applications as they choose. The plans for this application are similar to the plans submitted for the previously withdrawn application

DC/080521, however the rear dormer and inverted balcony which were previously proposed by that application have been removed.

Concern was raised that there may be overhang from the roof which then encroaches over No. 14's boundary. The proposed works will all take place within the red line plan and as such do no encroach over the boundary.

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