



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2021 by Hilary Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

Decision by R C Kirby BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/C4235/D/21/3278772

28 Calico Drive, Strines, Stockport, SK6 7GX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Sean Rodgers against the decision of Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref DC/080524, dated 10 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 9 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is proposed side ground floor ext with associated works. See note on drawing no 0503/21 shared party wall. Proposed joint build.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. Whilst the appeal site lies within the Green Belt, the Council have not indicated that the proposal is inappropriate development and have limited the reasons for refusal to insufficient information with respect to flood risk management and mitigation. From the evidence before me I have no reason to disagree and have therefore limited my consideration of the appeal to this matter.
4. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the proposal on flood risk.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site lies within Flood Zone 2 which is identified as having medium probability of flood risk in the Planning Practice Guidance. In such zones footnote 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) states that a site specific flood risk assessment should be provided for all development. Policy SIE-3 of the Stockport Core Strategy (2011) is consistent with national planning policy in this regard requiring that development complies with national policy requirements.
6. The appellant has provided a summary of flood risk to Mill Green, Strines dating from 2013 which the Council has indicated relates to the estate of dwellings upon which the appeal site is located. This assessment appears to relate to plot 67 Mill Green, but there is no certainty that the appeal dwelling was this plot.

7. In the absence of a site specific flood risk assessment, I cannot be certain that the proposed development would not be at risk of flooding from all sources and would not increase flooding elsewhere. Moreover, no measures are before me which would deal with potential effects or risks.
8. I acknowledge the appellant's willingness to have a flood risk assessment prepared for the property. However, there is not one before me as part of this appeal, which has to be determined on the evidence submitted.
9. Whilst there are other extensions in the area, I do not have the details them to establish whether they are comparable with the appeal proposal and in any event, I have determined this appeal on the site specific circumstances of this case.
10. I note the suggestion that an extension could be built without planning permission. The proposal before me relates to an application for planning permission and I have assessed it accordingly.
11. I therefore conclude that there is insufficient information relating to the flood risk of the proposal and any suitable mitigation. Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to Policy SIE-3 of the Stockport Core Strategy (2011) and the requirements of the Framework.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan as a whole and does not comprise sustainable development. There are no other considerations, that outweigh this conflict. I therefore recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Hilary Senior

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR