DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2019/0124 **Valid 25/03/2019**	**12 HOLYWELL CLOSE** **BIDDULPH**	**PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION. REMOVAL OF SECTION OF SHARED DOUBLE GARAGE AND CONSTRUCTION OF TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION.** **(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)**

MAIN ISSUES
Impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and the amenity of adjacent neighbours.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE
Late 1990s housing development in Biddulph Town Area. The applicant's two storey dwelling type is the same as its neighbour, and both properties stand at the head of the cul de sac either side of a shared double garage where each section of the garage lines up with its own drive divided by the boundary.

The land slopes up toward the head of the cul de sac and continues to the rear of the dwellings to steeply terraced gardens behind.

PROPOSAL
The applicant's half of the shared double garage would be demolished and the remaining half belonging to the neighbour would be made good as a single garage building. In the space created to the side of the applicant's dwelling, a two storey side extension would be built with an integral garage space at ground floor. The two storey extension would be set back from the front of the dwelling with a subordinate roof line.

A brick and tile built single storey rear extension would replace an existing conservatory at the back of the 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
SS5b Biddulph Area Strategy
DC1 Design Considerations
T1 Development and Sustainable Transport

National Planning Policy Framework
Section(s) 2 Achieving Sustainable Development; 4 Decision Making; 12 Achieving Well Designed Places.

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS
The Squirrel Hayes development was granted planning permission in the late 1990s.

09/01203/FUL Two storey rear extension and porch front extension. Approved (not implemented and permission has since expired)

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity
Site Notice expiry date: 24th May 2019
Neighbour consultation period ends: 31st April 2019
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments
1 Letter of objection has been received from the neighbour to the rear of the applicant's who feel that they might be overlooked.

Town / Parish Comments
Biddulph Town Council: No Objection

Staffordshire County Council Highways
No Objection

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development
In the settlement of Biddulph Town where area strategy SS5b applies, well designed householder development that does not harm the character and appearance of the area or the amenity of neighbours would be sustainable and acceptable in principle, compliant with the Development Plan and the NPPF.

Design
While a certain symmetry would be lost from the centre and head of the cul de sac, this would not be unduly harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene or residential environment. This is primarily because the design of the side extension observes certain principles promoted in the adopted SPD 'design guidance' and it respects the form character and scale of the existing dwelling. The existing front elevation would remain undisturbed and would retain existing proportions. The new side extension would tuck well beneath the main roof line and be set back from the existing elevation where it would be subordinate and recessive. Within the street scene the existing front elevation will remain dominant and unaltered while the new side extension, set back from the frontage, would only be visible or apparent from a very finite glimpsed view, directly opposite, from the roadside.

The extension to the rear would not be visible from the front and would have no impact on the wider street scene.

Amenity
The proposal plans demonstrate that a horizontal 45 degree sight line from the centre of the neighbour's window would not be breached by the rear extension that would be single storey; extend just 3m from the rear elevation; and have an eaves height of just less than 3m. The development would be permitted by the terms of the GPDO 2015, if it were not for the ridge height of the full pitch roof exceeding 4m. The extension would replace a conservatory and would have similar impact.

An objection has been received from the dwelling to the rear (131 Park Lane it is assumed but not specified). The neighbour is concerned that their property will be overlooked. However, there is a window to window separation distance of some 40m between the backs of these two properties. The neighbour has a large and long back garden and the land to the rear drops off steeply to the terraced arrangement of the applicants much shorter garden. The proposal does not bring first floor windows any closer to this neighbours dwelling than those that are already at first floor. This neighbour's amenity would not be harmed.

The side extension does not project beyond the existing front or rear building line and contains no side windows. There are no side windows in the gable of the neighbouring property that would be adversely affected. Existing boundary treatments would prevent any overlooking from the single storey extension side door and given the existing conservatory the situation would not be materially worse than at present.

Highway Safety
The County Highway Officer notes that the dwelling would become a four bedroom dwelling and standards would require 3 parking spaces. A generous drive provides just enough space for two spaces, and the County Officer suggests that the garage space is retained for parking. The proposed layout does not lend itself to an easy internal conversion that would add more living accommodation space to ground floor and result in the loss of a garage space.

A condition restricting the use of the garage would be of limited use, while it might prevent a conversion to habitable living accommodation there would be no reasonable way of insisting that a car actually parks in the garage or prevents it from being used for ancillary storage. I am not opting therefore to recommend such a condition because it would be of limited value and difficult to enforce.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE
The development would be sustainable householder development that would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the area or amenity of neighbours.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : APPROVE

Case Officer: Ben Hurst
Recommendation Date: 20/05/2019

X 

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council