Planning Statement

CLIENT: Mr R Spooner.

LOCATION:

Land to the rear of 82 - 84 High Street, Cheadle.
Staffordshire

PROJECT:

2 No Residential Dwellings
(alternative scheme to previously approved SMD/2013/0802).

Prepared by Nigel Forrester MCIOB

Planning Statement

Land to the rear of 82-84 High Street, Cheadle.

Residential Development

Proposed amendments to previously approved scheme.

Planning application Ref: SMD/2013/0802 for the construction of a block of 4no residential units was approved by SMDC on 22/07/2013.

The current owners of the site commenced the buildings work within the stipulated three year period in order to safe guard the planning approval. (Building Inspectors CPR of Stoke on Trent made site inspections of a section of foundation work).

The current owners of the site would prefer to construct a pair of standard dwelling instead of the 4No apartments currently approved.

Pre-application advise was sort and the enquiry was responded to by Lisa Jackson on 17/11/2017.

Mrs Jackson stated that the currently approved plans clearly set out the internal layouts of the approved dwellings and therefore the location and sizes of ''approved' principal windows could be identified. Approval of the earlier application for 4 flats showed that the positioning of the windows was acceptable and that it was possible to secure a satisfactory form of development. An alternative application should be for a building generally of the same form, size and location, with the window arrangement remaining similar i.e. no increase of principal windows overlooking surrounding properties to that previously approved.

The Pre-application enquiry specifically requested guidance on the issue of External Amenity Space (or the lack of it). The currently approved scheme indicates a small external amenity area but this is not allocated specifically to any of the flats and is not private. The question was asked: If an amended proposal was submitted for two houses instead of the four flats, what Amenity Space (private or otherwise) would be required. Reference was made to a recent scheme approved in Cheadle by SMDC, Application SMD/2013/0849 which was for the redevelopment of a former commercial site at 83 Tape Street and included 4No standard two storey dwellings none of which have any Amenity Space.

Continued....

Mrs Jackson stated that should the revised proposal be for two, 3 or 4 bedroomed properties, then such a proposal could not be supported by the planning authority because properties of that size needed to be accompanied by private amenity space. With regards to the approval given for the scheme on Tape Street, Mrs Jackson pointed out that these were predominantly two bedroom properties.

The informal officer advice resulting from the pre-application enquiry, (implied but not directly stated), which included a subsequent telephone conversation was that any amended proposal should be for units no larger than two bedrooms, that the revised proposal should conform as close as possible to the previously approved form, size and location and that the size and location of principal windows should be in accordance with those previously approved.

The proposal now being submitted is for a semi-detached pair of dwelling each comprising 2 bedrooms. It should be noted at this point that the previously approved scheme was for four, two bedroom units, that is to say the number of bedrooms in the now proposed units is the same as that previously approved. but the number of units has been reduced from four to two.

The new proposal is reduced in size when compared to the previously approved scheme by means of removing the front elevation, gable projection. The new proposal retains the same footprint, eaves height, overall height and basic form as the previously approved main body of the structure. This reduction in footprint has allowed an improvement in the amount of external amenity space and has allowed for specific allocations of amenity space to each dwelling.

The reduction in size by the removal of the front elevation gable projection also means that the currently approved minimum distance between the front elevation principal windows and the adjacent property (No 16), has effectively been increased by 4m.

The proposed internal layout has been determined by the constraints of the previously approved shape and size of the building and the positioning of principal windows in locations that accord with those previously approved.

The external appearance, detailing, fenestration etc. are all based on the previously approved details with the intention of providing a pair of traditional dwellings in-keeping with the local vernacular.

One area that does differ from the previous scheme is the positioning of the building within the site. The previously approved scheme replaced the existing brick boundary wall alongside Prince George Street with the external wall of the building. Although not obvious from the elevation drawings, which show the ground immediately up against the side elevation as being level; the approved position (see approved site plan) being right on the roadside verge means that the ground level on this elevation is at the same gradient as Prince George Street and therefore much lower than shown. The entrance door to Unit 2 opens almost directly onto the pavement.

Continued.....

The new proposal maintains the previous 'building lines' for the front and rear elevation walls but moves the building so as to be within the existing site boundary wall, rather than replacing the wall. This allows a pathway to be provided all the way around the property within the site boundary and allows for the retention of the existing boundary wall. (If this wall were to be removed it should be noted that there is a 1.25m difference in ground levels either side of the wall at the western most end. The retention of the boundary wall maintains the existing street scene and facilitates the provision of private amenity space for one of the new dwellings.

Parking arrangements are in accordance with the previously agreed scheme.

Visibility at the point of egress onto Prince George Street (which currently facilitates the number of cars using the car park) is maintained as currently exists. It should be noted that this is an improvement on the previously approved scheme because the existing boundary wall was being replaced by the external wall of the dwellings which projected into the existing access splay and would of course be much higher than the boundary wall. (see new drawing 18/543/04 for clarification of this point).