DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2019/0102	**37 DANE GROVE**	**BOX BAY WINDOW**
Valid 19/02/2019	**CHEADLE**	
		(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Design
- Neighbour amenity

DESCRIPTION OF SITE
Modern two storey brick semi with front garden of length c.9m fronting onto public green space parallel to Eaves Lane.

PROPOSAL
To erect a projecting rectangular bay across the single ground floor window of this dwelling which serves the sole living room. The width of the existing window is c. 2.3m and the bay would be 3m in length and project one metre. The bay would have a hipped lean-to roof in "plain acorn brown tiles". Walls of red brick to match existing dwelling.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Adopted 2014)
S01 Spatial Objectives
SS1 Development Principles
SS1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
SS5c Cheadle Area Strategy
DC1 Design Considerations

Local Plan Submission Version (February 2018)
SS1 Development Principles
SS1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
SS7 Cheadle Area Strategy
DC1 Design Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework July 2018
Paragraph(s) 1 – 14;
Section(s) 4 – Decision making; 12 – Achieving well designed places;

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS
None

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity
Site Notice expiry date: 24th March 2019
Neighbour consultation period ends: 21st March 2019
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments
From the occupier of the adjacent attached neighbour at number 35:

> "I live adjoining no 37 and as our seating at no.35 only has a view over the front garden of no.37 no further because of High hedge, their plans for a box window will affect us , their garden is our view....as the plan shows a side window overlooking no.35, please take into account our privacy ...."

Town / Parish Comments
Cheadle Town Council – no objections

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development
Within the Cheadle Town development boundary – development acceptable in principle.

Notably GPDO (2015) Schedule 2 part 1 Class D would permit a porch of up to the size in plan area of the proposed bay window subject to not being more than 3m above ground level. This proposal is not a porch and the door being to the outer edge of the elevation a PD porch would not be achieved in this more central position. Also the height of the proposed bay is marginally (c.150mm) above the 3m limit.

Nevertheless it is considered significant that a structure of comparable scale to the proposed porch could be added to the frontage of this building as PD.

Next door but two at 43 Dane Grove (a closely similar property) has a front porch addition – there is no recent record of a planning consent.

Design
Given the small general dimensions of this property the bay would be proportionately quite large. The character of the properties in general – the three blocks of similar pairs of semis – is plain and un-adorned. The addition of the perhaps slightly cumbersome porch to No.43 has disrupted this pattern. The bay now proposed would do so further but given that a porch of similar scale could be introduced this is not considered a strong point against the proposal.

Amenity
The representation from No. 35 is noted. In particular the concern about the side window of the bay. Protection of privacy is always a sensitive matter and a

neighbour's anxieties in this are understandable. However given that the bay would project only 1m (measured externally) the side window would give very little scope to view into No.35. It is judged that the impacts are likely to be very curtailed.

Due to the very limited projection of the bay (1m) there would be no appreciable incursion into the wider outlook from the front room of No.35.

Such bay windows with similar relationships to neighbouring dwellings and their windows are common on many properties and any adverse impact on amenity in terms of either privacy or outlook is considered to be insufficient to substantiate a refusal.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE
With the above points considered it is concluded that the proposal on balance should be approved.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : approve

Case Officer: Arne Swithenbank
Recommendation Date: 16th April 2019

X B.J. Haywood

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council