

Application No: 19/3201M

Location: 79, SHRIGLEY ROAD SOUTH, POYNTON, SK12 1TF

Proposal: Construction of a detached bungalow.

Applicant: John Parrott

Expiry Date: 30-Aug-2019

SUMMARY

It is considered that the proposal is environmentally, socially and economically sustainable and would accord with the Poynton Neighbourhood Plan, the development plan and the Framework. The site is located in a relatively sustainable location within the ribbon development of Poynton and the proposal is considered to represent an efficient use of land.

The principle of the proposed development is acceptable subject to there being no significant adverse impacts arising from the proposal at reserved matters stage.

This outline proposal clearly accords with recently adopted relevant policy in the neighbourhood plan and national guidance in the Framework.

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION: Approve subject to conditions

REASON FOR REPORT

The application has been called in by Councillor Saunders for the following reasons:

“The development is in the green belt and contrary to the policy set out in the CEC Local Plan and the planning framework, in relation to the green belt, especially in regard to its openness. R03HW additional turning movements, this road is narrow and would present difficulties with addition traffic.

There do not appear to be any details in respect of its elevations shown in the plans. The concern is that there could be potentially unneighbourly building, but there is no opportunity to comment”.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND CONTEXT

The application site covers an area of 0.07 ha and is situated on the east side of Shrigley Road South, Poynton. The site currently forms part of the side garden of No.79 Shrigley Road South and is adjoined to the north by the recently constructed replacement bungalow at No.77. The garden and driveway of No.81 Shrigley Road South lies to the south of the existing dwelling. The site forms part of the ribbon of residential development which runs along the east side of Shrigley Road South.

DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

This outline application proposes the construction of a detached bungalow and seeks permission for sole access and layout. Scale, appearance and landscaping are reserved for subsequent approval.

PLANNING HISTORY

None relevant

POLICIES

Local Plan Policy

Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (CELPs)

MP1 Presumption in favour of sustainable development

PG1 Overall Development Strategy

PG2 Settlement hierarchy

PG3 Green Belt

PG7 Spatial Distribution of Development

SD1 Sustainable Development in Cheshire East

SD2 Sustainable Development Principles

SE1 Design

SE2 Efficient use of land

SE3 Biodiversity and geodiversity

SE4 The Landscape

SE5 Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland

SE9 Energy Efficient development

SE12 Pollution, land contamination and land stability

SE13 Flood risk and water management

CO1 Sustainable travel and transport

CO3 Digital connections

Macclesfield Borough Local Plan saved policies (MBLP)

GC1 Green Belt

NE11 Nature conservation

DC3 Residential Amenity

DC6 Circulation and Access

DC8 Landscaping

DC9 Tree Protection

DC38 Space, light and privacy
DC63 Contaminated land

Poynton Neighbourhood Plan (PNP)

HOU 1 Higher Poynton (Infill Boundary)
HOU 6 Housing Mix
HOU 8 Density and Site Coverage
HOU11 Design

Other Material Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework)
National Planning Practice Guidance
Cheshire East Design Guide

CONSULTATIONS (External to Planning)

Head of Strategic Infrastructure – No objections subject to conditions relating to the provision of the access and visibility splays.

Environmental Protection – No objection subject to conditions relating to hours of construction, dust management, piled foundations, electric vehicle infrastructure and contaminated land.

United Utilities – No objection subject to conditions relating to drainage

Poynton Town Council – Object on the grounds of the development is in the Green Belt and is contrary to the policy set out in the Cheshire East Council Local Plan and planning framework related to the Green Belt, in particular, the principle of openness in the Green Belt. Additional turning movements due to Shrigley Road South being a narrow road and would be contrary to highway safety. - Shrigley Road South is heavily used by people visiting the Middlewood Way and other leisure facilities in the area including pedestrians and people on horseback. - There do not appear to be any elevations on the site so cannot comment as to whether the proposed building is out of character.

REPRESENTATIONS

One letter of representation has been received from a neighbouring property objecting on the basis of the proposed development is within the green belt therefore it is contrary to the National and local planning policy. It would affect the overall openness of the area, increasing the density of buildings. Along the road, at present, the garden provides an open vista to the trees at the back. There is also concern for the new development overshadowing no.77 and the proposed extra car access. The agreed frontage for 77 is a beech hedge not a low wall.

OFFICER APPRAISAL

Principle of Development

The site is located within the Green Belt where there is a presumption against inappropriate

development. Paragraph 145 of the National Planning Policy Framework and policy PG3 of the Cheshire East Local Plan set out the exceptions where certain types of development are described as not inappropriate. This includes 'limited infilling in villages'.

Infilling is defined within the glossary of the newly adopted Cheshire East Local Plan as 'The development of a relatively small gap between existing buildings' and this current proposal is a traditional infill between two buildings on the road frontage.

Saved policy GC1 of the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan does allow for infilling in a village; however this specifically refers to certain villages which are listed. This part of the policy has been disregarded in recent times by Inspectors at appeal. However nonetheless, the principle of infilling is acceptable within the Green Belt.

Policy HOU1 of the Poynton Neighbourhood Plan (PNP) states that:-

"Development within the village boundary is limited to small scale infilling which should satisfy all the following criteria for any exception to allow development to be permitted:

- 1. Any proposed development should preserve the openness of the Green Belt as one of the essential characteristics of the Green Belt including open views of the countryside.*
- 2. Any proposed development should not compromise the purposes of national Green Belt policy.*
- 3. Small-scale infilling only will be permitted as part of an otherwise substantially built-up frontage.*
- 4. Small-scale infilling would only provide for the filling of a narrow gap normally capable of taking one or two dwellings only.*
- 5. Substantially built-up frontage is defined as an otherwise continuous and largely uninterrupted built frontage of several dwellings visible within the street scene.*
- 6. The scale of any development should be compatible in character with the adjoining properties in terms of height, scale and massing. Any development should be built along the same front line as other adjoining properties and not forward of any adjoining property".*

The boundary of the Higher Poynton is defined by Appendix B Map 8. This site is within the infill boundary. It is considered that the proposed development is limited, in that it proposes one single-storey dwelling on a limited footprint as shown on the proposed layout plan, which is compatible in character with adjoining properties.

Thus the proposal would accord with criteria 2 to 6 of PNP Policy HOU 1 by definition. The slight variance from National Policy to PNP Policy is criterion 1 that states any development should preserve openness. This gap is so modest and the built form of any house would also be required to be modest within this built up frontage along Shrigley Road South. As such it is considered that the impact on openness is considered to be so negligible to be preserved.

It is considered that in light of the most current policy situation with a newly adopted neighbourhood plan and the NPPF that the proposal constitutes limited infilling within a village within the Green Belt and is therefore not inappropriate development. Therefore accords with policy PG3 of the CELPS and HOU 1 of the PNP.

Design and Amenity

Design and Neighbour amenity would be carefully considered in this case at reserved matters application stage but it is not considered that an appropriately designed development would have a detrimental impact on the impact upon the living conditions of neighbouring residents given that it would be a bungalow in a row of bungalows. Therefore it is anticipated that the reserved matters proposals would be capable of according with policies SD2 of the CELPS and DC3, DC38 and DC41 of the MBLP. As a result of the modest nature of the site permitted development rights are removed to maintain control over amenity, and to protect the openness of the Green Belt.

Highways

There are no material highway implications associated with the above proposal as:

- The proposal for site access is acceptable;
- There is sufficient space within the site for off-street parking provision to be in accordance with CEC parking standards;

There are no other material highway considerations associated with this proposal; accordingly, the Strategic Infrastructure Manager has no objection to the planning application subject to a condition regarding construction of the access and visibility splays.

Trees

The Forestry Officer has commented that the outline application is supported by an Arboricultural Statement by Cheshire Woodlands (Ref CW/9263-AS) dated 20th May 2019.

The outline proposals as presented identify the removal of three early mature trees from the front of the site identified as T2 – T4 these are all low value Category C trees their loss is not contested.

The group of Silver Birch identified as G1 are protected as part of the Macclesfield Borough Council (Poynton – 79 Shrigley Road) Tree Preservation Order 2003; a single moribund tree within the group has been identified for removal for safety reasons, again its loss is not contested.

The indicative build footprint establishes two minor incursions within the Root Protection Area (RPA) of the northern most trees associated with G1; it is accepted that providing a suitable tree protection scheme is provided and implemented construction implementation will not establish any long term impact on the group.

The proposed dwelling stands to the west of the protected group (G1); any issues of shading will be confined to the early morning period and can be improved with a limited amount of judicious pruning. In terms of social and spatial proximity the trees present to the proposed dwelling in its indicative form, this is reflective of the existing dwelling located off site to the north.

Providing any subsequent reserved matters application does not encroach beyond what is being proposed at present in terms of the RPAs of the retained protected trees, it is considered that the outline proposal is acceptable as presented. Should the application proceed to reserved matters consideration should be given to the location of the main habitable rooms and maximising the rear elevation glazed units.

Air Quality

Policy SE12 of the CELPS states that the council will seek to ensure all development is located and designed so as not to result in a harmful or cumulative impact upon, amongst other things, air quality. Whilst this scheme itself is of a small scale, and as such would not require an air quality impact assessment, there is a need to consider the cumulative impact of a large number of developments in a particular area. In particular, the impact of transport related emissions on Local Air Quality.

Accordingly, a condition is recommended requiring the provision of electric vehicle charging points in order to contribute to improvements in air quality and sustainability within the area and comply with policy SE12.

COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS

The key points of objection that have been received on planning grounds have been noted and addressed by the main body of the report. It is considered that the application clearly represents acceptable proposed development enshrined by policy HOU 1 contained in the newly adopted Poynton Neighbourhood Plan.

CONCLUSIONS AND REASON(S) FOR THE DECISION

The issues raised in representation have been duly considered however the proposals are considered to very clearly comply with National and Local Policy. It is considered to comply in particular with policy HOU 1 of the adopted Poynton Neighbourhood Plan, PG3 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy, saved policy GC1 of the Macclesfield Local Plan and the NPPF. There are no elevations submitted as the application is in outline seeking permission for access and layout.

Policy MP1 of the CELPS states that *“Planning applications that accord with the policies in the Development Plan (and, where relevant, with policies in Neighbourhood Plans) will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.”*

Accordingly the application is recommended for approval subject to conditions.

In the event of any changes being needed to the wording of the Committee’s decision (such as to debate, vary or add conditions / informatives / planning obligations or reasons for approval/refusal) prior to the decision being issued, the Head of Planning has delegated authority to do so in consultation with the Chairman of the Northern Planning Committee, provided that the changes do not exceed the substantive nature of the Committee’s decision.

Application for Outline Planning

RECOMMENDATION: Approve subject to following conditions

1. A03OP - Time limit for submission of reserved matters
2. A01OP - Submission of reserved matters- appearance, landscaping, layout,
scale
3. A01AP - Development in accord with approved plans
4. A03EX - Materials to match existing
5. A01GR - Removal of permitted development rights
6. Electric Vehicle Charging Point to be provided
7. Arboricultural Impact Assessment to accompany reserved matters
8. Surface Water drainage details to be submitted
9. Foul and surface water shall be drained on separate systems.
10. Visibility splays to be provided
11. Access to be provided
12. Contamination risk assessment to be submitted

