

Application No: 20/2966M

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

Proposal: Reserved Matters for approval of appearance, landscaping and scale following Outline application 19/3201M for construction of a detached bungalow

Applicant: Mr John Parrott

Expiry Date: 08-Sep-2020

## **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 and no significant adverse impacts arising from this reserved matters application have been identified.

The 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 outline application 19/3201M for access and layout was approved at Northern Planning Committee on 4<sup>th</sup> December 2019 on the basis that the reserved matters application was also referred to Committee.

## **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 reserved matters application seeks approval for appearance, landscaping and scale following the approval of outline application 19/3201M for construction of a detached bungalow

## **PLANNING HISTORY**

19/3201M – Outline application for construction of a detached bungalow – Approved 04/12/19

## **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

DC41 Infill Housing Development or Redevelopment

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 Borough Design Guide

### **CONSULTATIONS (External to Planning)**

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

**Environmental Protection** – No objections subject to same EVP condition and state that there is a former railway line and former garage/small petrol filling station adjacent to the application site. A Phase I Preliminary Risk Assessment report (Report Ref: 563.00.01, Redstart Northwest Ltd., April 2020) has been submitted in support of the reserved matters application. The report recommends further works be undertaken, these would also be incorporated under part a of Condition 12 of 19/3201M. As such no further recommendations to make at this time and the previous contamination condition should be attached to the reserved matters.

**Poynton Town Council** – Urges Cheshire East to ensure that this application, 20/2966M conforms in all ways to the Decision Notice for the outline consent 19/3201M. This must include the “footprint” of the bungalow, distance from the site boundary and height and massing. Also concerned that the applicants have not discharged conditions and should be rejected on that basis and state the applicants should be obtaining report on subsidence.

### **REPRESENTATIONS**

2 letters of objection on the basis of:-

- Significant adverse impact mainly due to overshadowing, loss of amenity and loss of outlook.
- Loss of open aspect and green belt
- Increase in traffic

*This is a summary and full comments are on CEC website*

### **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 and elevations, which is compatible in character with adjoining properties.

Thus the proposal would accord with criterions 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**

CELPS Policy SD2 notes that development will be expected to contribute positively to an area’s character and identity, creating or reinforcing local distinctiveness in terms of height,

scale, form and grouping, choice of materials, external design features, massing of development, and relationship to neighbouring properties, street scene and the wider neighbourhood.

Policy SE1 of the CELPS notes that development proposals should make a positive contribution to their surroundings by:

- Ensuring design solutions achieve a sense of place by protecting and enhancing the quality, distinctiveness and character of settlements
- Encouraging innovative and creative design solutions that are appropriate to the local context

The design is that of a modest single storey house in line with other developments in the vicinity and what is either side of the site and it is considered in character with the street and thus complies with policies SD2 and SE1 of CELPS and the Cheshire East Borough Design Guide. It is considered that the proposed house would be in keeping with local distinctiveness as prescribed by policy SD2 in that it would be single storey thus of similar "*height, scale, form and grouping*" and would have a balanced relationship to the neighbouring properties. It would also comply with HOU 11 of the Neighbourhood Plan as it would respect "*the form, layout, materials, siting, height, scale and design of the adjoining and surrounding buildings, the setting, and countryside*" and be "*sympathetic to the character of the local environment, the rural street scene, the linear and street frontage, and layout of development;*" It would accord with HOU 8 in that it would reflect "*height, form, extent and pattern of surrounding development*".

## Amenity

Saved Macclesfield Borough local Plan policy DC3 seeks to ensure development does not significantly injure the amenities of adjoining or nearly residential properties through a loss of light, overbearing effect or loss of sunlight/daylight with guidance on space distances between buildings contained in saved policy DC38 of the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan and guidance within the Cheshire East Design Guide.

It is considered that an appropriately designed development is proposed and would not 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. There would be approximately 8 metres between number 77 and the proposed bungalow. No. 77 has dormer windows at the side but there are no habitable room windows in the side elevation of proposed house – only roof lights in the slope of the roof so therefore DC38 is not directly contravened. Also as the proposed house is single storey it would not be considered overbearing and thus would comply with policy DC3.

As a result of the modest nature of the site permitted development rights were removed as part of the outline permission to maintain control over amenity, and to protect the openness of the Green Belt.

## **Landscape**

A landscape plan has been received and the driveway is proposed to be in reclaimed sets and bitumen macadam with existing hedges and trees to be retained and enhanced apart from one to be replaced by a silver birch and the boundary would be a timber close boarded fence. The Landscape officer has commented that given the rural location of this site in proximity to the Middlewood Way and Poynton Coppice, which are both popular recreation areas, it is recommended that the proposals should be amended as follows to strengthen the rural character of the area:-

The conifer hedges on the site frontage and on the northern boundary should be removed.

The existing hawthorn hedge on the frontage should be retained

The proposed Euonymus hedge should be omitted.

A new hawthorn (or mixed native) hedgerow should be planted along the frontage, and to the rear of the existing hawthorn hedge to thicken/reinforce, and should wrap around the northern boundary – to replace the conifer hedge.

The new native hedge should be planted behind the visibility splays - allowing sufficient space for the hedge to thicken without obstructing visibility. The approved sight lines should be added to the plan.

Any additional planting in front of the hedge within sight lines must be prostrate groundcover plants.

This would be than be considered to be in keeping and acceptable by preserving landscape character and quality as prescribed by policies SE4 and DC8 and an updated plan has been requested and is anticipated prior to the Committee meeting.

## **Highways**

The Highways Officer confirmed at outline stage that there were 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 had no objection to the planning application subject to a condition regarding construction of the access and visibility splays. On this basis permission for access has already be granted by the outline approval and there are no objections.

## **Trees**

Policy SE 5 of the CELPS outlines that development proposals which will result in the loss of, or threat to, the continued health and life expectancy of trees, hedgerows or woodlands (including veteran trees or ancient semi-natural woodland), that provide a significant contribution to the amenity, biodiversity, landscape character or historic character of the surrounding area, will not normally be permitted, except where there are clear overriding reasons for allowing the development and there are no suitable alternatives.

The footprint of the proposed bungalow, and its relationship to existing protected trees within the site is the same as that considered by the Council's Arboricultural Officer and subsequently approved at outline.

As part of his consultation comments the Officer requested an updated Arboricultural Impact Assessment to include tree protection details which has been provided with this application.

Accordingly, no arboricultural issues are raised to this reserved matters application, and the proposal is considered to comply with policy SE5 of the CELPS.

## 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 was included on the outline permission 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. The footprint would comply with the outline permission and conditions mentioned would need to be discharged. It is considered that the application clearly represents an acceptable form of 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, Local and Neighbourhood Plan Policy. It is considered to comply in particular with policies HOU 1 and 11 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. It also complies with relevant policies SD2 of CELPS and DC3, DC38 and DC41 of CELPS

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:

1. To comply with outline permission
2. Development in accord with approved plans
3. Materials as application
4. Implementation of landscaping scheme submitted with application
5. Obscure glazing requirement
6. Development in accordance with the Tree Protection Scheme and Arboricultural Method Statement

In order to give proper effect to the Northern Planning Committee's intent and without changing the substance of its decision, authority is delegated to the Head of Planning in consultation with the Chairman (or in their absence the Vice Chairman) to correct any technical slip or omission in the resolution, before issue of the decision notice.

