

Application No: 16/4527M

Location: 1, ORME CLOSE, PRESTBURY, CHESHIRE, SK10 4JE

Proposal: Demolition of the existing house to be replaced with two new build detached dwellings.

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Bryant

Expiry Date: 11-Nov-2016

REASON FOR REFERRAL

This application is referred to Northern Planning Committee as it has been called-in by the Ward Councillor over concerns that the development may represent over-development the site, appear out of character with adjoining properties and cause loss of privacy to the neighbouring sites. It is argued that this may be contrary to DC1, DC3, DC9 and the Village Statement.

Summary

The presumption in favour of sustainable development is a significant material consideration in the determination of this application and therefore taking into consideration the merits demonstrated below and the compliance with local and national planning policy, the proposed development meets all aspects of sustainable development and is recommended for approval.

The NPPF, at para 14, requires development proposals that accord with the development plan to be permitted without delay and thusly this application goes before the Planning Committee with a recommendation of approval subject to appropriately worded conditions being attached to any grant of permission.

The application raises no issues relating to design, highway safety or any adverse impact in respect of environmental issues.

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to conditions

PROPOSAL

This application seeks planning permission for the demolition of the existing two storey dwelling, subdivision of the plot, and erection of two detached dwellings. The two buildings

would be 5 bedroom comprising habitable space within the basement, ground floor and 1st floor. Light would be provided at basement level due to the lower land levels to the rear, whereby the basement floor would essentially assume the role of ground floor. To the front the appearance would be of one two-storey.

The buildings are to adapt a hipped roof style with a prominent gable to the front. A small recessed porch, chimney stacks, bay windows and a timber (painted white) fenestration have been incorporated to ensure a traditional detached appearance. The roofing tiles would be red clay and the main finish would be white render with a brick foundation.

Two parking bays are indicated for each plot in addition to an area of hardstanding which could provide a turning circle. Shrubbery and planting is indicated to the street frontage of the plot. To the rear, a small external terrace would immediately abut the rear elevation before an area of lawn which could provide the private external amenity space. A side access is also proposed to the sides of the respective car ports. A 1.8m close boarded fence would provide the main screening between the two rear gardens.

Following discussion with the architect, amended plans have been sought and received to reduce the height of the proposed dwellings. In particular, the height of dwelling 2 (plot 2) has been set down below that of dwelling 1.

Full consultation has been carried out on the plans submitted with the application.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site comprises a large detached residential dwelling and its curtilage set within the settlement boundary of Prestbury (as defined by the Local Plan Policies Map, 2004). The surrounding area is predominantly residential and the architectural styles in the area are distinctly varied.

The host building is two storey, with a distinct cat-slide roof to the principal elevation which incorporates two 'shed' style dormers and two traditional chimney stacks to the gables. A linked garage, and car port, exists to the side of the house. The building is finished in render with a brickwork base and a timberboarded (stained black) gable to the garage. The house fronts onto a large area of hardstanding and turning area, which has two access points to Orme Close. A substantial hedge has been established to the side boundaries and numerous mature trees exist to the rear of the site which provide a significant level of screening to the rear garden.

To the rear of the cul-de-sac, the buildings are packed more densely together, fronting onto a turning head, with nos. 1 and 2 to the entrance of Orme Close occupying larger curtilages. The dwellings are set back from the highway and many are partly screened by intervening vegetation (mature trees/shrubbery).

Due to the topography of the area, the land levels gradually descend west/south west through the site (from Brocklehurst Drive down through Orme Close) with the adjacent site, no.3 at a lower siting. The garden to the rear also falls below the ground level of the house.

Further west of Orme Close resides the North Cheshire Green Belt and an Area of Special County Value.

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

03/1665P – New bay window to rear at ground floor, new dormer window to rear of roof. Approved with conditions 14/08/03.

LOCAL AND NATIONAL POLICY

Macclesfield Borough Local Plan (2004)

BE1 (Design Guidance)
H2 (Environmental Quality in Housing Developments)
H5 (Windfall Sites)
H13 (Protecting Residential Areas)
DC1 (Design & Amenity – New Build)
DC3 (Design & Amenity – Amenity)
DC6 (Circulation and Access)
DC8 (Landscaping)
DC9 (Tree Protection)
DC35 (Materials and Finishes)
DC37 (Landscaping)
DC38 (Space, Light and Privacy)
DC41 (Infill Housing Development or Redevelopment)

Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy – Submission Version (CELP)

Policy SD1 (Sustainable Development in Cheshire East)
Policy SC2 (Sustainable Development Principles)
Policy SE1 (Design)
Policy SE2 (Efficient Use of Land)
Policy SE4 (The Landscape)
Policy SE5 (Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland)
Policy SE9 (Energy Efficient Development)
Policy SE12 (Pollution, Land Contamination and Land Instability)
Policy IN1 (Infrastructure)
Policy PG1 (Overall Development Strategy)
Policy PG2 (Settlement Hierarchy)

National Policy

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012) establishes a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Of particular relevance are paragraphs:

7 (Achieving Sustainable Development)

14 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
17 (Core Planning Principles)
32 (Promoting Sustainable Transport)
47-50 (Wide Choice of Quality Homes)
56-68 (Requiring Good Design)
69-78 (Promoting Healthy Communities)
109-11 (Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment)

The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) (as updated online)

Supplementary Planning Documents

Prestbury Supplementary Planning Document (2011)

Objective 3 (Ensuring appropriate development in the village)
Objective 4 (To ensure quality of access to dwellings and safety of roads within the parish)
Objective 5 (To protect the built and natural environment of the village)

Prestbury Village Design Statement

CONSULTATIONS

CEC Highways:

This is a full planning application for the development of two detached dwellings, with associated car parking and landscaping.

The proposals for access are satisfactory and I am satisfied there is sufficient space within each plot for off-street parking provision to be in accordance with CEC minimum parking standards for all dwellings.

Accordingly, the Strategic Infrastructure Manager has no objection to the planning application.

Nature Conservation:

No evidence of roosting bats was recorded during the submitted survey and I advise that the proposed development is unlikely to have an adverse impact upon this group of protected species.

If planning consent is granted I recommend that the following condition be attached to safeguard nesting birds and to ensure some provision is made for roosting bats as part of the proposed development:

United Utilities:

In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG), the site should be drained on a separate system with foul water draining to the public sewer and surface water draining in the most sustainable way.

Prestbury Parish Council:

The Committee object to this application on the grounds that it is an over-development of the site, it is out of character with the area and it is un-neighbourly causing loss of privacy to neighbours especially to the neighbour on the right hand side due to the topography of the land. It contravenes DC1, DC3 and DC9 and also the Village Design Statement. They would want the hedges retained and protected during any building work.

Arboricultural Officer:

The application is supported by a Tree Report (Ref PM/30/08/2016) dated 30th August 2016 by Murray Tree Consultancy. The report indicates that the assessment has been carried out in accordance with the recommendations of British Standard BS5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction.

The majority of the retained tree cover associated with this site is located on or adjacent to the periphery of the development plot, with a mature Beech hedge forming the eastern boundary. Apart from two trees (T15 & T18) a single group of trees (G3) and the hedge (H1) which have been categorised as being of moderate value (B) all the remaining trees have been identified as low value (C) specimens; there are no high value trees (CAT A) associated with this application which are a material consideration.

All the trees identified for removal (T10 – 14, 16, & part of G1) have been identified as low value specimens. I would concur with this designation, and raise no objection to their removal and loss.

The revised plan in respect of Plot 1 establishes an excavation and construction build on the eastern elevation inside the line of the existing patio wall and associated room served by bi-folding doors. The existing eastern elevation and its associated foundation will have acted as a barrier to root development in respect of the adjacent hedge H1. The proposed car port reflects the eastern edge of the existing structure with the new car port constructed without any substantial foundation. Removal of the entire elevation closest to the hedge can be facilitated under an agreed method statement, to ensure roots which present between the hedge and existing foundations are not compromised, this can be addressed by condition. The protective fencing detail requires amending to reflect the space between the hedge and the new building line; this again can be dealt with by condition. Providing these requirements are implemented throughout the course of the development the hedge should not be compromised.

The absence of any direct or indirect impact on high value trees considered worthy of formal protection under a Tree Preservation Order removes any possible objection to this application from an Arboricultural perspective. The revised plans address the initial concerns in relation to the hedge (H1), and any impact on its future health and longevity.

REPRESENTATIONS

10 letters of objection received, summarised as follows:

- The submitted application is incomplete, inaccurate, self-contradictory and misleading, therefore not satisfying the Cheshire East Council Planning Application Validation requirements.
- Waste storage and collection management is not clear.
- The use of upvc and metal exteriors are not in keeping with the surrounding properties.
- Impact on the existing sewers is not clear, there are no specific plans regarding drainage.
- 2 new dwellings will put pressure on the existing sewerage system.
- Protected trees on neighbouring properties have been marked as no, with no clear indication as to how they will be affected.
- The removal of trees and hedges to the boundary or on neighbouring properties would have an impact on the character of the local landscape.
- Shrubbery and trees on the site provide privacy and character for neighbouring residents.
- The removal of trees on the boundary will impact the levels of light and noise heard from the proposed dwellings.
- The proximity of plot 2 to the boundary brings the built structure much closer to the boundary with our property. The effects of this on soil, erosion, trees, the landscape and privacy have not been properly evaluated.
- The elevation of the structures on Plot 1 and Plot 2 need to be confirmed as not being higher than the current dwelling on the plot, as privacy is compromised during certain months of the year.
- Internal layout of the proposed dwellings could have an impact on the privacy of existing residents.
- The overloading on the drainage system would impact surrounding residents.
- Increased surface water run off could cause issues to the boundary, and as such details of retaining walls etc should be provided.
- No surface water drainage scheme has been proposed, raising concerns regarding the impact on neighbouring plots.
- The exclusion of a garage in the design of the dwellings, is contrary to the character of the area.
- if the new dwellings are further back on the plot than the current dwelling, we would object to this and would maintain the dwellings not be further down the lot than as at present. This objection applies to any documents which show either Plot 1 or Plot 2 extending further down the site than the existing dwelling.
- There is no reference to the downward slope of Orme Close.
- The subdivision of 1 Orme Close would impact the character of the village.
- The proposed design is not seen elsewhere in the immediate area.

- The removal of trees to the rear of the plot, and the introduction of fencing would have an impact on the security of the surrounding plots.
- Other wildlife in addition to bats, such as squirrels, owls, birds etc make use of the surrounding trees and the proposed development would disrupt that wildlife.
- There is no reference to the use of energy efficient materials to ensure that the dwellings will meet regulatory standards.
- The tree survey makes reference to trees on neighbouring properties such as the Larch, Spruce etc. However, the comments here are merely observations and cannot be accurate as to the condition of those trees (e.g. the Larch being nearly dead) because that would have required an inspection on that lot. We therefore cast doubt as to the accuracy of these observations at present without the survey confirming that the actual trees have been inspected with the permission of the owners of the lots upon which those trees reside.
- Building close to a well established boundary hedge could result in the destruction of the hedge, contrary to the Arboricultural Report submitted with the application.
- The development may be contrary to a covenant on the land. The covenant would restrict the level of development on the plot.
- If the deeds are legally binding the development should not take place.
- 10 Brocklehurst Drive is currently not occupied. Therefore efforts should be made to contact the owner in order for the required consultation to be made available.
- There is a lack of clarity within the application with regards to the construction timetables, suppliers, working hours etc.
- Access to neighbouring dwellings will be affected by the construction traffic.
- Overdevelopment of the plot.
- The overall impact of this proposal would create the impression of urban denseness in a traditional low- density housing area and impact the spaciousness of the street scene for the Close.
- Archway shaped front doors and bay windows are totally out of character, and will be very ugly in this context.
- Impact on light to neighbouring properties, and a bad outlook onto a boundary wall and side wall of a tall property.
- Creation of additional traffic on the Close will result in difficult vehicular access.
- Inconsistencies regarding parking provision for each dwelling.
- The mass and height of the properties would dwarf the neighbouring houses and are not proportionate to the plot size.
- All dwellings in the immediate vicinity have been built at land level. The proposed dwellings are being raised to facilitate a basement level, therefore will be imposing in the area.
- The proposals will disrupt the current land to building ratio on Orme close.
- Concern regarding complying with the council's environmental policy and responsibilities, due to the impact on the character of Prestbury Village.
- The proposed development is in direct conflict with the Prestbury Village design statement in that 'New developments should conform to the density in the part of the village in which it is taking place but also to the building scale of the immediate area.'

The full content of the above objections can be viewed on the public file. These have been noted and considered in the determination of this application.

Issues relating to covenants, legal matters, working hours and suppliers are not material planning considerations which can be afforded significant weight in this decision making.

The details submitted are considered sufficient, in enabling the Local Planning Authority to satisfactorily determine this application. Two site inspections have been carried out on 26th September 2016, and 14th October 2016. Public consultation has been carried out in accordance with statutory requirements.

APPRAISAL

Key Issues

- Principle of development;
- Design considerations
- Character of the area
- Impact upon amenity of neighbouring properties
- Highway Safety Implications
- Flooding issues
- Ecology Implications
- Arboricultural Implications
- Sustainability

Principle of Development

The application site resides within an area designated as predominantly residential (as defined by the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan, 2004). Within this designation, the principle of development is considered acceptable by the development plan and national policy. The NPPF strongly emphasises, at paragraph 14, there is a “presumption in favour of sustainable development” and that this is vital in decision-taking. With reference to decision-taking, this means approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay, unless there are significantly adverse reasons for doing so.

Design assessment

The buildings would comfortably fit within the proposed plots, without appearing cramped or excessive. Whilst increasing the development of the site, the size of each building is not materially larger than the existing building on the site. The setback of the building in plot 2 also prevents the two being directly perceived together and would soften the visual bulk when approaching the site (from a Brocklehurst Drive to Orme Close direction).

The use of bay windows, chimney stacks, a recessed porch, and a large hipped roof all adds to the aesthetic design which results in two well proportioned, balanced buildings. Whilst the building, essentially, appears 3 storey to the rear, this would not be apparent when perceiving the house from Orme Close.

An external (side) access would be retained for both properties which would facilitate external maintenance of the house and allow additional space for storage of residential paraphernalia (in line with policies DC1 and DC43 of the MBLP). No bin stores are indicated within the plans although these could be stored within the car-ports or to the side/rear of the properties. This would not cause harm to the visual amenities of the area. The gardens are suitably sized and would provide a sizeable external amenity area for both plots.

The landscaping details and proposed levels submitted are satisfactory, showing soft treatments to the front of the site, a good ratio of lawn to hardstanding and a landscaped approach to the principal elevation. .

Effects on the character of the area

The street scene is characterised by large detached residential dwellings of varying styles. The dwellings themselves have an individual feel due to the range of materials, architectural features and non-uniform size. Building lines are slightly varied, but generally follow the curvature of the turning head and the properties are notably set back from the highway with intervening trees/hedges. In support of the relevant local plan policies, the Prestbury Design Statement emphasises the need to prevent inappropriate developments, in particular developments which don't respect the character of the village.

The proposed buildings would add some uniformity to the area through the reflective style of the pair. However, the buildings are of a good design, and this uniformity would not significantly detract from the appearance of the area. The setback, and small set down, of plot 2, coupled with the 2.3m separation gap would help to visually separate the pair and reduce any terracing effect. A gap of approximately 12m (plot 1) and 18m (plot 2) would prevent the built forms crowding or dominating the street scene, and this gap is generally in keeping with the surrounding buildings. The landscaping to the front of the site would also soften the impact of the buildings. The set back of plot 2, which would follow the curvature of the turning head, also allows a more continuous building (footprint) progression around Orme Close.

Following discussions with the architect, the heights of the proposed buildings have been reduced. The dwelling to plot 1 is of the same height as the existing building, and the dwelling to plot 2 has been set down by approximately 30cm. This has helped to reduce the scale of the buildings whilst maintaining the architectural style and also allows the building height to follow the natural land level changes and subsequent roof height changes down to the rear of Orme Close. The use of hipped roofs to the side of plot 2 would support a more sympathetic appearance when viewing the site from the rear of Orme Close and again softens the impact of the more elevated siting.

Concerns have been raised regarding the use of features such as recessed porches, bay windows and a car port, and that these may not be visually in keeping. Design, however, as highlighted at paragraph 60 of the NPPF, is a subjective matter, and planning decisions should not attempt to stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development styles. With this in mind, and in the recognition that these would not be prominent in the street scene, these features are acceptable.

As discussed previously, the garden sizes are suitably sized and, from perspectives of the street scene, the built density of Orme Close and spacing between buildings would largely be preserved. Planning decisions should reinforce local distinctiveness but should not, as outlined above, make developers conform to certain development forms or styles, when there is an absence of harm to the character of the area. The openness to the front of the site would be maintained, and the architect has been successful in visually separating the two buildings to reduce the density of the site. In respect of this, the openness of Orme Close would be retained and the character of the public realm preserved. This accords to policy DC1, the NPPF and supplementary planning guidance.

A range of materials are noted in the area including different shades of render, brickwork, tile hanging and timber boarding. The proposed finish of the dwellings (render, brickwork and slate tiles) would correspond to this juxtaposition of materials and thus be in keeping with the material finish of the surrounding buildings. The scheme would create a good balance of unity and variety, achieving a high standard of design in accordance with policy DC35 of the MBLP.

The design would add to the overall quality of the area, optimising the potential of the site, and would appear visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping. The proposal accords with the NPPF, the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan, the objectives of the Prestbury SPD and the Prestbury Village Statement.

A condition is proposed to be attached to any recommendation for approval ensuring that no dormers or other large roof extensions (Class B of Part 1, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015) can be achieved without planning permission. This will prevent any significant harm to the character of the two dwellings.

Residential amenity

The proposal would project a built form closer to the boundary with no. 3, which given the slight change in land levels would sit in an elevated position above the neighbouring site. Saying this, the design incorporates a hipped roof and smaller car port to the side which helps to soften the bulk of the building when viewed from the adjacent site. A gap of 2.6m would be created between the car port and side elevation of no. 3, and a gap (at 1st floor level) of 6.2m. This is sufficient in preventing a significant overbearing impact or causing any significant losses of sunlight or daylight. The proposed buildings would not project any further rearwards than no. 3 and as such the development would not harm the private external amenity area of no. 3.

No concerns are raised in respect of an overbearing presence towards no. 6 (Brocklehurst Drive). The car port and larger building (plot 1) would reside in a similar location to the existing building and would not exacerbate any significant overbearing presence nor cause significant losses of light. Any small losses of light would likely be limited to winter and later hours of the day and is considered to be relatively insignificant when assessed against the existing building/elevations. It is acknowledged that should the mature hedge die or become severely reduced there would be a slight visual impact on the garden of the neighbouring site. However, conditions will be attached to any decision ensuring the longevity of this boundary treatment and the Arboricultural Officer is satisfied that the development would not directly

harm the wellbeing of this hedge. Nonetheless, the built relationship between the two sites is acceptable and the scheme would not significantly harm neighbouring residential amenities.

No 1st floor windows are indicated in the side elevations of either building, and such windows could not be inserted without being obscure glazed and non-opening (above 1.7m). This is a requirement of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) (Class A of Part 1 of Schedule 2). There could potentially be a small line of sight towards neighbouring gardens (nos. 3 and 6) from the rear 1st floor windows although this would be at an oblique angle and not significantly invasive.

The decking/elevated platforms to the rear would not provide a significant platform for overlooking and the plans indicated that the mature hedges established along the boundaries would be retained.

In light of the above, the proposal accords with Local Plan policies DC3, DC41 and H13 and is thus acceptable on grounds of residential amenity.

As discussed in previously, a condition will be attached to any approval ensuring that no roof additions (i.e. dormers) can be inserted within the sides or rear of the building. This will help to safeguard the amenity of nos. 3 and 6.

Highways

Two parking spaces are indicated within each plot in addition to a large area of hardstanding which would provide a sizeable turning area. It is expected that vehicles could safely exit the site in a forward gear without compromising highway safety or pedestrians use of the footpath.

The Strategic Infrastructure Manager has been consulted and raised no objection. The off-road parking provision is sufficient for both dwellings, and the existing access points would be retained. Visibility would be appropriate when entering/exiting the site and given the small nature of Orme Close, vehicle speeds would likely be low.

The site resides in a sustainable location with good access to local amenities and public transport links. The site is within walking distance of Prestbury Village Centre. Buses run through Prestbury providing frequent transport to larger settlements. Prestbury train station also supports links to Manchester, Stoke and other nearby towns/cities. The NPPF encourages, at various points, the reduction in use of the private vehicles and encourages a shift towards other sustainable modes of transport. Whilst the provision of two to three parking bays seems slightly excessive for a 5 bedroom dwelling, this would help to reduce occasions of on-street parking. As per above, the occupiers would also have opportunities to use more sustainable transport methods.

Flooding issues

The site is not situated within an Environment Agency designated flood zone. The concerns relating to drainage have been noted although it is considered that adequate drainage would be provided through the large areas of permeable surfaces within the curtilage. A scheme for the drainage of surface water from the site will be required through a condition on the decision notice.

It is not considered that this scheme would significantly exacerbate any present flooding within the neighbouring sites or the immediate locality and is thus acceptable in this aspect, in line with the NPPF.

Ecology and Nature Conservation

A bat survey has accompanied the application which has been completed by a suitably experienced ecological consultant. The conclusion has identified that, whilst the surrounding habitats offer 'moderate' quality bat foraging habitat, no evidence of roosting bats or significant bat roosts were recorded within the dwelling and thus the development is unlikely to have a harmful impact upon the protected species. The inspection was carried out in daytime and evening conditions.

Conditions have been suggested by the CEC Principal Nature Conservation Officer to secure the wellbeing of the bats and safeguard nesting birds. The conditions relate to a detailed survey to check for nesting birds and if found, include an appropriate exclusion zone until breeding is complete, and in respect of bats, features will be installed in accordance with the recommendation of the submitted bat survey.

These features include the fitting of a bat box to the external wall of the new dwellings which should have a southerly aspect and be fitted at a minimum height of 4m, ideally located at a gable end apex and not illuminated by any artificial lighting. Any artificial illumination should be mitigated through the use of shields or low level lighting.

It is considered that the provision of these features would assist with the continued presence of bats and thus provides an environmental benefit. The proposal accords with the NPPF, and specifically policy NE11 of the local plan.

Arboricultural impacts

The Arboricultural Officer has been consulted who has raised no objection to the works subject to appropriate tree protection conditions. These conditions will ensure the retention and wellbeing of the hedge which contributes positively in respect of visual amenities and residential amenities. Particular care must be given to the removal of the existing properties eastern elevation, which will be subject to a detailed method statement for approval by the LPA.

Some small trees are indicated to be removed although these are considered to be low value specimens and their loss is of no significant concern. A very minor incursion is identified within the RPA of T18 although this is considered inconsequential, and would not detract from the moderate value tree.

Sustainability

Environmental sustainability

Taking into account the above sections the proposal is considered to represent an appropriate form of development in the context of the area, and one which would preserve the environmental merits of the immediate and wider locality and uphold the existing residential amenities. The visual amenities which contribute to the street scene would be preserved and there would be no significant highway issues, flood risk issues, harm to the wellbeing of any significant trees, or harm to the biodiversity of the area. The scheme is therefore deemed to be environmentally sustainable.

Social sustainability / Housing Land Supply

Paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires that Councils identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years' worth of housing against their housing requirements. The Council currently remains unable to demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land.

Further to this, the NPPF clearly states at paragraph 49 that:

“housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites”

This must be read in conjunction with the presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out in paragraph 14 of the NPPF which for decision taking means:

“where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless:

- any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole; or
- specific policies in the Framework indicated development should be restricted.”

The key issue of this scheme, is therefore, whether there are any significantly adverse impacts that would weigh against the presumption in favour of sustainable development or whether specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted.

Weight in itself is given to the sustainability of the site which is considered to represent “*optimum viable use*” as prescribed in paragraph 134 of the NPPF.

It is recognised that the provision of one additional house within the site would provide a small social benefit and a small contribution to the housing requirements of the Borough. The scheme would help to provide family housing with Cheshire East, which both locally and nationally is shown to be in demand.

Economic sustainability

The proposed development will help to maintain a flexible and responsive supply of land for housing, albeit to a small extent. Some direct and indirect benefits for the local economy will also be evident, including additional trade for local shops and businesses.

Jobs in construction and economic benefits to the construction industry supply chain could also be supported within the local area and wider Cheshire East environment.

It is acknowledged that, whilst these economic benefits would exist, they are considered to be relatively minor.

Summary and Planning Balance

The objections have been noted and considered, however the presumption in favour of sustainable development is a significant material consideration in the determination of this application. Taking into account the merits of the application, and compliance with both local and national planning policy, the proposal satisfies all aspects of sustainable development. It is acknowledged there would be a greater impact on the character of the area than that at present. However, in respect of the tests of Paragraph 14, the benefits of the scheme significantly and demonstrably outweigh the increased impacts on the built environment, which are not considered significantly adverse.

Paragraph 14 of the NPPF requires development proposals that accord with the development plan to be permitted without delay. Thusly this application goes before the Planning Committee with a recommendation of approval subject to appropriately worded conditions being attached to any grant of permission.

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 Planning and Enforcement Manager 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.

RECOMMENDATION

Approved subject to conditions:

- 1. Standard Time Limit (3 years)**
- 2. Development to be carried out in accordance with approved plans**
- 3. Materials as per those in application**
- 4. Removal of Class B Permitted Development Rights**
- 5. Bird Nesting**
- 6. Features for roosting bat**
- 7. Parking to be provided and made available prior to occupation**
- 8. Landscaping**

- 9. Surface Water Drainage Scheme**
- 10. Tree Protection Condition**
- 11. Tree Pruning Condition**
- 12. Detailed Method Statement for demolition**

