

## Werneth Area Committee

### ITEM 1

<b>Application Reference</b>	<b>DC/088065</b>
<b>Location:</b>	7 The Crescent Bredbury Stockport SK6 2DY
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	First floor extension over side garage and a change in roof design. (Amended)
<b>Type Of Application:</b>	Householder
<b>Registration Date:</b>	14.04.2023
<b>Expiry Date:</b>	09.06.2023 (EOT to 18.09.2023)
<b>Case Officer:</b>	Aisling Monaghan
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mrs Sarah Ashman
<b>Agent:</b>	N/A

### DELEGATION/COMMITTEE STATUS

Werneth Area Committee. The application has been referred to Committee as a result of 4 neighbour objections received contrary to the officer recommendation.

### DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

This application seeks planning permission for the erection of a first floor side extension over an existing garage and a change in roof design from a hipped roof to a gable end roof.

The initial application included a rear dormer. However, amended plans were requested to remove this element.

The first floor side extension would measure approximately 8.1m to the ridge and measure 5.9m to the eaves, it would also be set below the existing ridge height by 0.24m. The extension would measure 7.08m in length, 2.88m in width and would be set back at first floor level by 1m.

On the front elevation, one window is proposed at first floor level and on the new roof plane two rooflights are proposed. On the rear elevation one window is proposed at first floor level and on the new roof plane two rooflights are proposed. No windows are proposed on the side elevation.

A change in roof design from a hipped roof to a gable end roof is also proposed.

## **SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

The application property is a two storey semi-detached house with a hipped roof and a front facing gable end feature, a driveway to the front and a north-west facing rear garden.

No. 6 and No. 8 The Crescent is located south-east of the application property, No. 5 The Crescent is located to the south, No. 9 The Crescent is located to the north and No. 45 and No. 47 The Crescent are located to the north-west. The rear gardens of No. 45 and No. 47 The Crescent face the rear elevation and rear garden of the site.

The Crescent is a residential street comprising of semi-detached two storey dwellings.



*Site outlined in red (Image from Google Maps)*





(Images of the surrounding dwellings on The Crescent, taken from Google Maps).

## **POLICY BACKGROUND**

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (“PCPA 2004”) requires that planning applications be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

### **The Development Plan includes-**

- Policies set out in the Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review adopted 31<sup>st</sup> May 2006 which have been saved by direction under paragraph 1(3) of Schedule 8 to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004; &
- Policies set out in the Stockport Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document adopted 17<sup>th</sup> 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  
CS8: SAFEGUARDING AND IMPROVING THE ENVIRONMENT  
SIE-1: Quality Places  
SIE-3: Protecting, Safeguarding and enhancing the Environment

### **Supplementary Planning Guidance**

Supplementary Planning Guidance does not form part of the Statutory Development Plan; nevertheless, it does provide non-statutory Council approved guidance that is a material consideration when determining planning applications.

'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' Supplementary Planning Document (adopted in February 2011) states that the issue of design is a highly important factor when the Council assessed proposals for extensions and alterations to a dwelling. The Council require all development to be designed to a high standard in order that it makes a positive contribution to the provision of an attractive built environment.

## **National Planning Policy Framework**

A Revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) issued by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) on 20th July 2021 and replaced the previous NPPF (originally issued 2012 & revised 2018 and 2019). 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. If decision takers choose not to follow the NPPF, then clear and convincing reasons for doing so are needed. In respect of decision-taking the revised NPPF constitutes a "material consideration".

Para.1 "The National Planning Policy Framework sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these should be applied".

Para.2 "Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise".

Para.7 "The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development".

Para.8 "*Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways (so that opportunities can be taken to secure net gains across each of the different objectives):*

- a) an economic objective*
- b) a social objective*
- c) an environmental objective"*

Para.11 "Plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

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.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. 130 “Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

- a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;
- b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;
- c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);
- d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;

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.”



## **Planning Practice Guidance**

The Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) is a web-based resource which brings together planning guidance on various topics into one place (launched in March 2014) and coincided with the cancelling of the majority of Government Circulars which had previously given guidance on many aspects of planning.

## **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

None

## **NEIGHBOUR'S VIEWS**

The owners/occupiers of 9 surrounding properties were notified in writing of the original application.

Letters of objection were received to the application from 4 properties/land owners. Following the receipt of amended plans, the neighbours were reconsulted, but no further objections or comments were received. The main causes for concerns raised are summarised below:-

- The proposed rear dormer would result in a loss of privacy and overlooking to the neighbour's home and garden. *(The dormer has been omitted from the proposal)*
- The proposed dormer is not in keeping with the character of the streetscene. *(The dormer has been omitted from the proposal)*
- The proposed dormer would appear overbearing and obtrusive. *(The dormer has been omitted from the proposal)*
- The proposal would result in a loss of light and overshadowing. *(Assessed within the report below)*
- Concerns also raised regarding the extra bedrooms proposed with only 1 parking space, with parking on the road not available. *(Assessed within the report below)*

## **CONSULTEE RESPONSE**

None

## **ANALYSIS**

### 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 buildings and residential areas from unsympathetic changes by ensuring that consideration is given to the context in which they are sited.

#### *Change in roof design*

The SPD states that where planning permission is required for a change of roof design, this is unlikely to be appropriate in areas where a certain roof design is predominated due to the adverse impact on the street scene this may cause.

The application proposes to change in roof design from a hipped roof to a gable end roof. Within The Crescent, there is a mix of hipped and gable end roof designs, including in the pairs of semi-detached dwellings. Therefore, there are existing examples within the immediate street scene of the proposed new roof design. Therefore, it would be unreasonable to refuse the application on this element and subsequently, the change in roof design is considered to be accepted.

The proposed new roof tiles will match the existing roof tiles.

#### *First floor side extension*

The SPD states that two-storey side extension should:

- Respect the form and design of the existing dwelling with a roof design that complements the existing appearance.
- Ideally appear subservient to the main dwelling with the ridge level of extensions set below the main ridge line of the original house.

A linked or infill effect between neighbouring dwellings should be avoided by leaving a visibly adequate gap between the boundary and the side wall of the extension. Whilst it is necessary to consider each situation individually, the Council is concerned that where two storey side extensions are proposed to homes in areas of mainly detached or semi-detached housing the character should not be lost through terracing extensions. In such areas houses should not be physically or visually linked, particularly at first floor level.

Two storey side extensions should therefore be set back from the front of the property by a minimum of one metre behind the front main wall of the house, or by 1 metre from the side boundary. The joining up of detached or semi-detached properties can also result in future maintenance difficulties.

The proposed first floor side extension would present a gable end roof design and it would be set below the existing ridge line by 0.24m. The proposed extension would also be set back at first floor level by 1m. Therefore, it will appear subservient and would not result in a terracing effect.

The application proposes to remove all of the external render at first floor level due to the majority of the existing render being blown and not connected to the brickwork. The application then proposes to render the whole of the first floor level with flat render to match the entire level. There is a mix of materials within the existing streetscene, including brickwork, render and other materials. Therefore, the proposed render is considered to be acceptable due to the diverse existing streetscene.

### *Conclusion*

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 that it would not result in harm to the character of the street scene or the visual amenity of the area in accordance with UDP policy CDH1.8 and Core Strategy policy SIE-1.

### Impact on Residential Amenity

CDH 1.8: Residential Extensions of the saved UDP states that extensions to residential properties are only permissible where they do not 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, 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.

### *Change in roof design*

It is deemed that the change in roof design will not result in any loss of privacy or neighbour amenity/overshadowing/loss of light to the neighbouring dwellings as the ridge height will remain the same as the existing ridge height. Therefore, it is deemed acceptable.

### *First floor side extension*

The adjacent property, No. 9 The Crescent, has an existing two storey extension to the side and there are no habitable room windows within the side elevation of this property. No side windows are proposed on the side elevation facing towards No. 9 and the ridge height will match the existing. Therefore, it is deemed that the proposed first floor side extension would not result in any loss of privacy or neighbour amenity/overshadowing/loss of light to No. 9 The Crescent.

The SPD states that between habitable room windows on the public or street side of dwelling a distance of 21m must be present. One new window is proposed on the front elevation at first floor level facing No. 6 and No. 8 The Crescent, a distance of 23m will be present between the habitable windows. Therefore, the side extension will not result in any loss of privacy or neighbour amenity to these neighbours.

The SPD also states that between habitable room windows on the private or rear side of dwelling a distance of 25m must be present. One new window is proposed on the rear elevation at first floor level facing the rear gardens and rear elevations of No. 45 and No. 47 The Crescent, a distance of 20-24m will be present between the habitable windows on the rear elevations. Although this does not comply with the 25m rule, the application must be assessed in its own merits. The proposed rear window would not be sited any closer to properties to the rear than the existing rear windows, therefore no additional loss of privacy or overlooking would result when compared with the existing situation. It is therefore considered that the proposed new first floor rear elevation window would be acceptable.

Two new rooflights are proposed on the front and rear roof plane, as they are facing upwards due to the slant of the roof plane, they will not result in any loss of privacy or neighbour amenity/overshadowing/loss of light to the neighbouring dwellings.

### **Other Matters**

The proposed extensions would result in the creation of two additional rooms, one of which is detailed on the plans as a bathroom. The other room has not been detailed;

however, it is a possibility that it would be used as another bedroom. The property currently has use of two parking spaces, one within the existing garage and one within the front of the site on the hard standing area. The car parking spaces are to remain the same if the proposed extensions were approved. It is therefore considered that a sufficient provision car parking spaces will remain for the size of this dwelling.

### **SUMMARY**

The general design of the proposed development is considered acceptable in terms of its relationship to the existing dwelling, the character of the street scene and the visual amenity of the area in accordance with UDP policy CDH1.8 and Core Strategy policy SIE-1.

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.

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 complies with the content of these documents.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Grant