DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2020/0432 **Valid 19/10/2020**	**2 STONEHOUSE ROAD** **WERRINGTON**	**RETROSPECTIVE PERMISSION FOR 2 SHEDS FORWARD OF FRONT ELEVATION** **(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)**

MAIN ISSUES
Impact on the character and appearance of the area; and the amenity of the residential neighbours

DESCRIPTION OF SITE
The semidetached dwelling occupies a corner position at the junction of Stonehouse Road with Washerwall Lane. The plot has a roughly triangular shape where it is very wide at the pavement front but narrows to a point at the rear of a short back garden behind the dwelling. Much of the frontage is enclosed by a dense privet hedge which has been grown to conceal much of the property from Washerwall Lane.

The boundary between the applicant and the adjoining neighbour is high dense privet hedge. On the other side of the property the estate hedgerow has been replaced on the boundary with a two metre high close boarded fence between concrete posts.

PROPOSAL
The applicant has already constructed two timber garden sheds, but they need planning permission because they are built between the front of the dwelling and the highway. Neither shed exceeds 2.5m in height, the one closet to the house is the slightly larger of the two at 2.4m by 3.6m, the other is right at the front in the corner of two intersecting boundary hedges at 2.4m by 3.5m.





Additionally, he did want to erect an octagonal shaped greenhouse/summerhouse structure that would have been placed between the shed that is closest to the house and the boundary shared with the neighbour. It was however felt that this would

increase the presence of ancillary structures, of differing size and design, within a more exposed area of the site more prominently forward of the dwellings. The applicant has confirmed that this proposal is withdrawn and deleted from their application.



RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Adopted 2014)

SS1 Development Principles
SS8 Larger Village Strategy
DC1 Design Considerations
T1 Development and Sustainable Transport

National Planning Policy Framework

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS
None

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 16th Nov 2020
Neighbour consultation period ends: 16th Nov 2020
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments
One letter of objection has been received from the adjacent neigbour. The following points are raised:

- Both sheds A&B are entirely forward of the wall forming the principal elevation.
- The applicant may cover more than 50% of their curtilage with buildings and extensions.
- Shed B is within falling distance of the front and adjoining dividing hedge rows which are of a similar height to the shed's ridge.
- Shed A has a very bright security light fitted above the access doors this causes a nuisance.

- The greenhouse would also be forward of the principal elevation, the drawing shows an overall height of 2.6 meters high, it is not clear what the distance would be between the greenhouse and the boundary fence which is not owned by the applicant

Town / Parish Comments
Awaited

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development
The site is within the 'Larger Village' of Werrington where the Local Plan larger village area strategy SS8 applies. The strategy SS8 generally provides for development that retains and enhances its role as a rural service centre having regard to local needs, infrastructure, capacity, and character. Such development might include the provision of garden outbuildings at a dwellinghouse to meet the needs of a resident. However, to be sustainable and strategy or NPPF compliant the development must represent good design that does not harm the character and appearance of the area or the amenity of neighbours to accord with policy DC1 of the Local Plan and section 12 of the NPPF.

Impact on the character and appearance
The dwelling's garden and curtilage, the majority of which is at the front of the dwelling because of the triangular plot arrangement where the rear narrows to a single point, is enclosed to the front by the estate privet hedge. The hedge is high and thick meaning that the shed closest to the pavement edge is set in from the boundary, it is only possible to see glimpses of its roof by standing well back from the property, it is well screened from all angles and does not have an impact on the character and appearance of the local environment.



The other shed is on the side of the property that is slightly more exposed, partly because estate hedgerow, shared with and to the front of the neighbour, has been replaced with a brick wall and fence. From Stonehouse Road to the front of the driveway or from the northeast, the top of the sheds full pitched roof and a small area of its gable end is apparent above fence line. However, the shed is set well back from the pavement edge and its simple form is close to and against the house with visual association. It is relatively quiet on not prominent in the wider environment.

Neither of the sheds are harmful to the character and appearance of the area and there is no conflict with policy DC1 of the Local Plan.

Amenity

It is not entirely clear whether the adjacent neighbour objects on amenity grounds or exactly what those concerns might be. They raise several points, which can be discussed and responded to here:

- The existing and proposed sheds are indeed forward of the dwelling, between the front of the property and the highway, that is why planning permission is required.

- Only relevant to the provisions of the GPDO, development is not permitted if it would result in over 50% of the total curtilage covered by buildings, otherwise planning permission is required. This is a planning application for that permission, but in any event, it is clear and obvious that buildings and/or extensions do not cover over 50% of the dwelling's curtilage.

- Shed B is in the corner of the curtilage at the front, enclosed by the hedgerow which is thick and grown to a height of around 2 -2.5m high, this is a 'similar' height to the shed, and this is discussed separately above in respect of character and appearance.

- The neighbour complains that Shed A has a bright security light fitted above the access door that causes a nuisance. It is not unusual or unreasonable for a householder to use security or amenity lighting within their garden, rarely requiring planning permission because they are small and require very little in the way of fixings. The small light could be just as easily attached to the wall of the dwelling where it would not need planning permission.

- The proposal to build Greenhouse C has been withdrawn and deleted from the application.

Shed A, the closest to the neighbour on the north east side, is at least 8m from the side elevation of the neighbour's dwelling. Located 4metres from the boundary fence only a small part of its roof would be visible above the fence. The neighbour has only a second kitchen window and an obscure glazed utility window (non-principal) in their side elevation. The existing sheds do not unreasonably harm the amenity of the adjacent neighbour.

The sheds are screened from the adjoining neighbour on the other side by the mature hedge between the two properties. It does appear as though there have been sheds in the location of Shed B for some years.

No harm to neighbouring amenity or conflict with Local Plan Policy DC1.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

Provision of conventionally sized garden sheds. No harm to character and appearance of the area or residential amenity.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : APPROVE

Case Officer: Ben Hurst
Recommendation Date:

X 

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council