

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2021/0219
Valid 07/04/2021

3 NURSERY DRIVE
BIDDULPH

**SINGLE STOREY REAR
EXTENSION CONNECTING TO
HOUSE TO GARAGE.
EXTENSION OF GARAGE TO
THE REAR AND FRONT.
PORCH EXTENSION TO THE
SIDE ELEVATION.**

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

The impact on the character and appearance of the area
The impact on residential amenity

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The site is within the development boundary of Biddulph and lies to the north-west of the town centre. It comprises a modern 1960s style semi-detached bungalow on a cul-de-sac development of similar dwellings. The cul-de-sac road lies to the north and there are other bungalows either side to the west and east and also dwellings the rear of the site to the south.

PROPOSAL

This is a householder planning application for extensions which comprise the following:

- Single-storey rear extension with pitched roof and rear facing gable. This would adjoin onto the side wall of a detached garage in the rear garden next to the side boundary.
- Single-storey flat-roofed side extension to create a small enclosed porch in front of the current entrance door (which is to the side of the bungalow and not the front) which also includes a flat-roof overhanging canopy up to the side boundary.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Staffs Moorlands Local Plan (adopted September 2020)

DC1 – Design Considerations

NPPF (Revised February 2019)

Sections 12 (Design).

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

None.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 27.5.21

Neighbour consultation period ends: 27.5.21

Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

None.

Town / Parish Comments

No adverse comments.

Local Highways Authority

No objection.

Severn Trent Water

No objection.

OFFICER COMMENTS

The rear extension is small scale in relation to the existing dwelling and has a pitched roof although the pitches are steep in relation to the existing low pitches of the bungalow. Although it therefore does not completely harmonise with the form of the bungalow it remains subservient to the main dwelling due to the lowered roof ridge and would not be visible from the road or public footpaths. It would not significantly harm the appearance of the dwelling. It would have a brick finish to match the side and rear walls of the bungalow. There would be side and rear facing windows but as the structure would be single-storey, boundary screening would prevent overlooking and there is already a conservatory with side glazing at the neighbouring property facing the proposed side window so any overlooking between neighbours would be mutual. There would be a significant gap between the extension and side boundaries and rear boundary so there would be no loss of light to or overshadowing of neighbouring properties.

With regard to the side extension, this would have a rather oblique and contemporary appearance with flat roof canopy which along with the proposed porch flat roof would be above the existing eaves of the bungalow. However, as it is a small extension set back considerably from the front wall of the dwelling, it would not be harmfully prominent from the road and although it is not entirely in line with the form of design of the bungalow, it would not harmfully detract from its 1960s style.

There are flat-roofed structure elsewhere in the cul-de-sac development including the side/rear detached garages like the one on site. The side addition would have a render finish and this would match the front wall of the bungalow (facing the road). The side extension would face the side wall of the neighbouring bungalow and as there are no primary windows on this elevation, the side extension would not harm the residential amenities of that property.

Although the use of the garage would be lost for the purposes of parking a car, there exists at least two off-road parking spaces on the existing driveway which is sufficient for the parking needs of a 2-bed property.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The proposed extensions would not harm the visual or residential amenities of the area and would therefore comply with the Local Plan as well as the government planning guidance contained in the NPPF.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : APPROVE

Case Officer: Chris Johnston
Recommendation Date: 11.6.21

X *B.J. Haywood*

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council