

ITEM 3

Application Reference	DC/090581
Location:	4 Hill Top Romiley Stockport SK6 4AY
PROPOSAL:	Proposed three storey side extension (top floor in roof void), two storey and single storey rear extensions, internal re-modelling and conversion of existing loft space to habitable space with new dormers to front and rear.
Type Of Application:	Householder
Registration Date:	11.12.2023
Expiry Date:	05.02.2024
Case Officer:	Anthony Smith
Applicant:	Mr Mark Thorley
Agent:	

COMMITTEE STATUS

Should the Werneth Area Committee be minded to grant permission under the Delegation Agreement the application should be referred to the Planning & Highways Regulations Committee as the application relates to a Departure from the Statutory Development Plan.

DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

The application seeks planning permission for a *“Proposed three storey side extension (top floor in roof void), two storey and single storey rear extensions, internal re-modelling and conversion of existing loft space to habitable space with new dormers to front and rear”*

The proposed side extension (described above as a three storey extension) would begin level with the front elevation and project out 3.85m from the side elevation. The extension would proceed down the length of the dwelling and on to the rear elevation. The projection beyond the rear elevation would be 1.8m and the two storey part would have a width of 10.2m across the rear elevation. The remaining part of the rear extension would be single storey and finish 1m from the boundary with 2 Hill Top. The height of the two storey extension would be 8.5m with a pitched roof (matching that of the existing roof). The single storey rear extension would have a height of 3m with a flat roof.

It is proposed to alter the existing roof. At present, the roof has several differing ridge heights. The western ridge has the highest and it drops down towards the eastern part of the dwelling. It is proposed to increase the height of the middle section to match that of the western ridge. The eastern section (closest to the adjoining property) would increase by 0.6m.

The revised roof would facilitate three dormers to the front elevation and one single rear dormer across the majority of the roof.

The plans also show a canopy to the front elevation at ground floor level.

Materials include white render and slate tiles to the revised roof and dormers.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The applicant's property is a semi-detached two storey property with a pitched roof and finished in white render. The windows are white UPVC. Vehicular access is gained from Hill Top via a single track road. The site is built into the side of the valley and this does mean steep changes in gradient in most directions around the site. The rear garden has a steep gradient to the north.

The applicant is also constructing a detached outbuilding under permitted development (Schedule 2, Part 1, Class E of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015). This would be sited to the west of the two storey side extension. It does not form part of this application.

The application site and neighbouring sites are in Green Belt.

To the east is the adjoining property of 2 Hill Top which is the same style/architecture as the applicant's property but it does have a lower ridge height.

To the south of the site are open fields and Hill Top Farm.

To the west of the site is 6 Hill Top- a detached bungalow which appears to be newer than the other properties within the immediate area.

The surrounding area can be described as diverse with no dominant form of architecture.

SITE HISTORY

J/37592- Planning permission

Single storey extensions to rear and dormers over garage.

Approved on 06/11/1986

The permission was partially implemented with dormers being erected to the front of the garage but not to the rear. The single storey rear extension has since been demolished.

DC/083595- Proposed Lawful Development Certificate

Construct single storey side extension no more than 1/2 width of existing dwelling, eaves no more than 3m, ridge no more than 4m. Construct single storey entrance porch less than 3sqm, eaves no more than 3m. Construct single storey rear extension near boundary, eaves no more

than 3m, ridge no more than 4m. Construct two storey rear extension away from boundary, eaves no more than existing, ridge no more than existing. All materials to match existing

Approved- 09/02/2022

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 May 2006 (SUDP) which have been saved by direction under paragraph 1(3) of Schedule 8 to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004:

GBA1.2: CONTROL OF DEVELOPMENT IN GREEN BELT

GBA1.5: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT IN GREEN BELT

CDH1.8: RESIDENTIAL EXTENSIONS

- Policies set out in the Stockport Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (CS) adopted 17th March 2011.

SD-2: MAKING IMPROVEMENTS TO EXISTING DWELLINGS

SIE-1: QUALITY PLACES

N.B. Due weight should be given to relevant SUDP and CS policies according to their degree of consistency with the National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF') issued on 27th March 2012 (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the NPPF, the greater the weight that may be given); and how the policies are expected to be applied is outlined within the Planning Practice Guidance ('PPG') launched on 6th March 2014.

National Planning Policy Framework Conformity

The Planning Advisory Services' National Planning Policy Framework Compatibility Self-Assessment Checklist has been undertaken on Stockport's adopted Core Strategy. This document assesses the conformity of Stockport's adopted Core Strategy with the more recently published NPPF and takes account of saved policies from the Unitary Development Plan where applicable. No significant differences were identified.

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) is one such consideration.

National Planning Policy Framework

An updated National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published by the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities in December 2023 and replaced the previous revised/updated NPPFs.

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. Relevant paragraphs within the NPPF include: -

Para. 1, 2: Introduction

Para. 7-14: Achieving sustainable development

Para. 38: Decision-Making

Para. 47: Determining applications

Para. 131: Designing high quality buildings and places

Para. 142 and 143: Aims and purposes of the Green Belt

Para. 153: Very Special Circumstances within the Green Belt

Para.154: Building within the Green Belt

Para. 224: Implementation

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.

NEIGHBOURS VIEWS

The owners/occupiers of three surrounding properties were notified in writing of the application. The initial neighbour notification period expired on the 4th January 2024. To date, 3 objections have been received. Points include;

- Loss of privacy and amenity to surrounding properties (this point has been made by all objectors)
- The proposal represents over development of the property and adversely affect the character of the area
- The building work has started without planning permission being approved
- The increase in ridge height is greater than the plans suggest
- Protected trees could be affected
- The permitted development outbuilding would also impact amenity
- Previous loss of hedge row
- Parking issues

CONSULTEE RESPONSES

None

ANALYSIS

Residential Amenity

Key sections of the Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings SPD (relating to privacy and amenity) state:

“Neighbouring occupiers are entitled to a reasonable level of privacy, both within their homes and outside in their private gardens. In determining planning applications, the Council will ensure that new extensions do 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 Council will not normally protect privacy to windows to non habitable rooms, secondary, high level and obscure windows or where windows have been added to the original dwelling under permitted development rights. In assessing the effect of an extension on privacy and overlooking, the individual circumstances of the property will be taken into account.”

“An extension to a property should not harm a neighbouring occupiers’ daylight to an unacceptable degree. When assessing this, the impact of the proposal on the amenity of the dwelling as a whole will be considered. Particular attention will be given to protecting principal habitable room windows. The Council will not normally protect daylight to secondary, high level and obscure windows or where windows have been added to the dwelling under permitted development rights.

Adjoining house-2 Hill Top

The proposed single storey rear extension would have a 1m gap to the common boundary with No.2. The rear elevation of No.2 does include a principal habitable room close to the common boundary with the application site. The impact upon this window is considered acceptable, noting it is northern facing, a suitable projection of the proposed single storey rear extension and it’s 1m gap to the boundary.

The proposed two storey rear extension would be over 6m away from the boundary with No.2 Hill Top. This is a suitable distance to ensure no undue loss of amenity to the rear elevation of No.2.

The proposed rear dormer would be at least 2m away from the common boundary with No.2 and the impact is not considered unduly worse compared to the existing which includes a

rooflight in a similar position. Furthermore, under J/37592, a rear dormer was approved in a similar place on the rear elevation of the applicant's property.

It is considered that all aspects of the scheme would have an acceptable impact on the amenity of 2 Hill Top.

Hill Top Farm and 6 Hill Top

The closest part of the scheme to 6 Hill Top would be the side extension and this would be at least 25m away from the side elevation of No.6. This is considered ample separation and would not cause harm to the amenity of No.6. There are also protected trees between these two elevations.

The closest part of the scheme to Hill Top Farm would be the front dormers and these would be at least 55m away from the side elevation of Hill Top Farm. This is considered ample separation and would not cause harm to the amenity of Hill Top Farm.

The impact on all neighbours amenity is judged to be acceptable.

In conclusion, it is considered that the proposal would be in compliance with amenity policies as advised above (UDP policy CDH1.8 and Core Strategy policy SIE-1 as well as the NPPF and Extensions SPD).

Design

Policies contained within the Core Strategy and the Saved UDP are clear when they state that proposed developments should be of good, high-quality design and not adversely affect the character of the streetscene.

These policies (SIE-1 in the Core Strategy and CDH 1.8 in the Saved UDP) are further supported by the Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings SPD. The following extracts from the SPD are relevant to the application;

“Any extensions or alterations to a property should:

- ***Respect the form, shape, symmetry and proportions of the existing dwelling and complement 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).”***

Policy SIE-1 of the Stockport Core Strategy DPD states that development that is designed and landscaped to the highest contemporary standard, paying high regard to the built and/or natural environment within which it is sited, will be given positive consideration. The policy also sets

out that specific account should be had of a number of issues, including appropriate materials, the special characteristics of the site, the potential to enhance the public realm and to incorporate the qualities and local distinctiveness of the historic environment.

The applicant's property is located within an area of mixed character. There is no dominant form of architecture with No.6 Hill Top being a bungalow and No.8 being a 1950s detached dwelling. Further afield sees more varied forms of architecture.

The proposed two storey side extension would have a suitable sideways projection and would not dominate the existing dwelling. The proposed rear extensions would be concealed from public view but are also considered acceptable on design grounds with their respective roof forms and materials.

The proposed front canopy is considered respectful to the host dwelling and wider streetscene.

The proposed roof form is similar to the existing and the overall ridge height of the dwelling would not be increased. The proposed materials would include white render and slate. These are considered acceptable and respect the character of the host dwelling.

It is considered that the proposed dwelling would have an acceptable design.

In summary, the extended house would respect the character and appearance of the street scene and surrounding locality. As such, the proposal would be in compliance to saved UDP policies CDH1.8 as well as Core Strategy DPD policy SIE-1 and the Extensions SPD.

Green Belt

Saved UDP Policy GBA1.2 states that there is a presumption against the construction of new buildings within the Green Belt unless it is for certain purposes, including limited extension and alterations to existing dwellings.

Saved UDP policy GBA1.5 states that proposals relating to existing residential uses may be permitted in certain cases, including alterations and extensions where the scale, character and appearance of the property would not be significantly changed.

The interpretation of significant change will vary according to the character of the property but as a general guideline, extensions which increase the volume of the original dwelling by more than about one third are unlikely to be acceptable.

The material test to the acceptability of proposals within the Green Belt is the impact of the siting, size and scale of the proposal on the character and appearance of the dwelling and on the overall openness of the Green Belt.

Original dwelling- 1003 m³ (does not include an existing rear extension which has been demolished in 2003)

Existing front dormer extension above the integrated garage- 5m³

Existing dwelling- 1008m³

Proposed extensions- 582m³

Proposed dwelling- 1590m³

Total extensions (existing and proposed) = 587m³ which equals 58.5% volume of the original house.

In this respect, the volume of the proposed extensions would clearly exceed the one-third increase in volume referenced in policy GBA1.5. The proposal would represent inappropriate development within the Green Belt by virtue of a disproportionate addition.

Where development is considered inappropriate, it should only be granted where 'Very Special Circumstances' exist. The material test to the acceptability of proposals within the Green Belt is the impact of the siting, size and scale of the proposal on the character and appearance of the dwelling and on the overall openness of the Green Belt.

It is considered there are 'Very Special Circumstances' to justify the scheme, the conclusions of which are provided below;

- The property has permitted development rights and provides a fallback position for development. Permitted development rights are intact and represent a realistic fall back position

The agent has undertaken an exercise to demonstrate extensions possible under permitted development and they include;

Single storey side extension
Single storey rear extension
Two storey rear extension
Front porch

These extensions have been assessed as part of approved application DC/083595 and could be implemented.

The agent has calculated that volume of a potential dwelling under these permitted development extensions as 1681m³- 91 cubic metres greater than what is proposed under the planning application.

Furthermore, it would be possible that further outbuilding(s) would add much greater volume of built development.

- There would be adequate levels of separation between the proposed extensions and the neighbouring properties. The property is also located in a spacious plot with acceptable levels of separation on all sides.
- The property is also located in ribbon development, it is not an isolated dwelling.
- The proposed extension does not harm the openness of the green belt due to the above factors.

The property benefits from full permitted development rights for the erection of extensions/outbuildings. Therefore sizeable extensions could be constructed without any control from the Local Planning Authority, to the front, side and rear elevations as well as the roof space,

The possible schemes under permitted development are comparable to what is proposed in the sense they are two storey and single storey extensions.

The proposed scheme in this planning application is the preferred option as it does demonstrate acceptable design and would not be an incongruous addition to the streetscene, nor it would unduly impact the openness of the green belt.

The Local Planning Authority should take this opportunity to grant planning permission for what is an acceptable development and place a condition on the decision notice removing any further permitted development (involving extensions) in the future.

Larger extensions albeit of a concentrated form can sometimes be accommodated whilst avoiding harm to the overall openness of the Green Belt. In this instance the resulting development is of a concentrated form which overall, would be sympathetic to the character of the area. Should planning permission be granted, a condition would be placed on the permission removing all permitted development rights associated with extensions to the dwelling.

Energy Efficiency

Core Strategy DPD policy SD-2 states that the Council recognises the importance of improving the energy performance of Stockport's existing building stock. Therefore, energy efficiency measures and low carbon and renewable technologies are encouraged. Planning applications for changes to existing domestic dwellings will be required to undertake reasonable improvements to the energy performance of the dwelling. Improvements will include, but not be restricted to: loft and cavity wall insulation, draught-proofing, improved heating controls and replacement boilers. Applicants will be asked to complete a checklist to identify which measures are appropriate to their home.

The local planning authority has received a checklist and Policy SD-2 is complied with.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

It is noted that protected trees sit to the west of the site. These would be over 16m away from the proposed side extension and this is considered an acceptable distance that no undue damage would occur to these trees. They are also afforded their own protection under the TPO.

There would be parking for one vehicle away from the highway and this complies with adopted parking standards.

The content of all neighbour submissions has been examined and duly considered. The scheme is considered acceptable on material planning considerations. Some aspects of the neighbour objections are not material planning considerations and these cannot be afforded weight in the recommendation of this report.

Summary- 'Sustainable Development'

Overall the proposal is in compliance with adopted planning policy and guidance.

At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through decision-taking. The NPPF establishes three dimensions to sustainable development – economic, social and environmental and these should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system.

In this instance there are several benefits that weigh in support of the proposal, in particular acceptable design, impact upon residential amenity and the submission of an energy checklist.

The proposal would not unduly impact on the residential amenity of the surrounding properties or prejudice a similar development by a neighbour, in accordance 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 existing dwelling, the character of the street scene and the visual amenity of the area (Including the Mill Brow Conservation Area). As such, the proposal would be in compliance to saved UDP policies CDH1.8 and HC 1.3 as well as Core Strategy DPD policies SIE-1 and SIE-3 and the Extensions SPD.

Other material considerations such as the Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings SPD and the revised NPPF have also been considered and it is judged the proposal also complies with the content of these documents.

Whilst the proposed additions to the dwelling can constitute inappropriate development within the Green Belt (in planning policy terms), it would have only limited harm to the openness of the Green Belt and the case for 'Very Special Circumstances' is sufficient to outweigh harm by reason of inappropriateness.

On balance the proposal amounts to Sustainable Development, consequently it is recommended that permission be granted subject to appropriate planning conditions.

Conclusion

In considering the planning merits against the NPPF as a whole the proposal represents sustainable development; Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that the application be granted subject to conditional control.

Recommendation

Grant- with conditions

WERNETH AREA COMMITTEE- 22/01/2024

https://stockport.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/839770/start_time/372400

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

Members asked about the lawful development certificate position, privacy standards. The Planning Officer answered those queries.

One neighbour spoke against the application, raising issues relating to privacy, amenity, the submitted plans, chimneys and lack of consultation with neighbours.

The applicant spoke in favour of the application. They spoke about previous works to the property and how the proposals have changed over time. They also spoke about Green Belt aspects of the scheme.

Members asked about privacy standards, topography and previous planning history, including the approved LDC. Further detail was provided by the Planning Officer. Further questions were asked regarding car parking and the Planning Officer responded that the scheme complies with adopted parking standards.

The Planning Officer clarified the proposed conditions (should the application be approved).

Members resolved to refer the application to the Planning and Highways Regulation Committee for determination with a recommendation to grant.