

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2021/0344
Valid 21/05/2021

18 ELM DRIVE
CHEADLE

SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION
TO THE SIDE AND REAR

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

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

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The site is within the development boundary of Cheadle and lies on a modern housing estate to the east of the town centre. It comprises a modern 2-bed detached bungalow at the end of a cul-de-sac. There are other dwellings either side of it to the west and east and the road lies to the south (front). There are other dwellings to the rear of the site to the north.

PROPOSAL

This is a full householder application for single-storey extensions to the side and rear, forming a “wraparound extension”. The dwelling would remain with two bedrooms but these would be enlarged. The rear extension would be a continuation of the rear gable form of the current bungalow whereas the side extension would have a double side-gable form. As a result of internal alterations to the existing bungalow as part of the extension scheme, the entrance door, which is currently at the side, would be moved to the front elevation (facing the end of the cul-de-sac to the south). The extensions would have brick and tile finishes matching the existing.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Local Plan (Adopted September 2020)

DC1 Design Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)

Sections 12 (Design).

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

None.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 16.7.21
Neighbour consultation period ends: 16.7.21
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

A letter of support has been received from the adjacent dwelling to the east (No.16).

Town / Parish Comments

No objection.

Severn Trent Water

No objection.

OFFICER COMMENTS

The site lies within the settlement boundary of Cheadle, whereby Policies SS2 and SS7 apply. Cheadle is identified as one of the larger settlement in the District where new housing and economic development will be supported. Accordingly, the general principle of development is considered to be acceptable, subject to design, amenity and highway considerations.

Design

The scale and form of the extensions would harmonise with the scale and form of the bungalow and the fenestration and materials would also not be out of keeping with the design. The proposed roof ridges to the side would be slightly below the main roof ridge and the proposed front wall would be slightly recessed behind the main front wall, the primary elevation. This would result in the extensions appearing subservient to the main part of the bungalow, respecting its design. Overall it is considered that the extension would complement the existing dwelling and would not harm the character of the street scene.

With regard to residential amenity, despite the rearward projection of the extensions, the two adjacent dwellings either side are already set back considerably behind the bungalow and so the rear windows of those dwellings would not be affected in terms of overshadowing. Furthermore, the side windows of those dwellings, facing the extensions, are secondary windows. The one at No.16 to the east is a large dining room window but there is also a main window on the rear elevation serving this room, the side window is already affected by a boundary wall and the dwelling is on higher ground than the application site. Therefore, the dining room at No.16 would not experience any significant loss of light (also a letter of support was received from the resident). The light provision at the dwelling to the west would also not be affected. The side extension would move the dwelling closer to the front windows at No.16 as the bungalow is further forward than the No.16 dwelling. The nearest window at No.16 is a large bay window serving a living room. However, the 45

degree line from the mid-point of this window would be only slightly clipped by the side extension. As the window is already large and is a bay window receiving light from a wide scope and also as No.16 is on higher ground than the bungalow, there would also be no significant loss of light to the living room at No.16.

In terms of privacy there would be two new windows directly facing the neighbouring properties, comprising a side-facing utility room window and a side-facing bathroom window. Both of these would face No.16 but as this is on higher ground and the views into the side dining room windows are partly screened by a boundary wall, I do not consider the level of overlooking from the proposed windows would significantly harm the level of privacy enjoyed by the occupants of No.16. However, a condition should be imposed to ensure that the bathroom window, where the common boundary wall lowers to ensure that the privacy of this neighbour is maintained.

Despite the loss of the side driveway due to the proposed extension, there is ample parking at the front of the bungalow for at least two vehicles on the site, in line with the Council parking standards.

Conclusion

The proposal would not harm the visual or residential amenities of the area and would therefore comply with the Council's Local Plan as well as being in line with the government planning guidance in the NPPF.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : APPROVE

Case Officer: Chris Johnston
Recommendation Date: 16.7.21

X 

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council