

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2021/0316
Valid 10/05/2021

79 BASFORD BRIDGE LANE
CHEDDLETON

SIDE/REAR/FRONT
EXTENSIONS
SINGLE STOREY AND TWO
STOREY TO FORM HALL
DAYROOM UTILITY AND WC
ON THE GROUND FLOOR
ADDITIONAL BEDROOMS
ENSUITE ON FIRST FLOOR

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

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

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The site lies within the development boundary of Cheddleton and comprises a semi-detached dwellinghouse which faces Basford Bridge Lane to the south and there are similar dwellings to the west (including the attached semi-detached house) and east sides of the site. There are also dwellings to rear up a slope towards the north and also to the other side of the road to the south opposite the site.

PROPOSAL

This a full householder application for a two-storey side extension and adjoining single-storey rear extension. The side extension would primarily have a side-facing gable and would project beyond the back wall of the existing house forming a rear-facing gable and at ground floor level would also project slightly forward of the front wall of the house in the form of a “lean-to” which would extend across to form a porch in front of the existing front door to the house, whilst the proposed first-floor front wall would be set back behind the existing front wall of the house. The single-storey extension would span the whole width of the existing house and would have a lean-to roof. Amended plans were received to reduce the width of the side extension (by 0.4 metres), add a half-hip to the roof to match the existing half-hipped design of the main existing roof and also to reduce the width of the proposed ground floor front window to match the widths of the other front windows, with two small secondary windows added to the side elevation to allow more light into the proposed living room.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Local Plan (Adopted September 2020)

DC1 Design Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)

Section 12 (Design).

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

None.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 16.6.21

Neighbour consultation period ends: 16.6.21

Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

Letters of objection have been received from two neighbouring properties and the points raised are as follows:

- The rear extension has already been built and it damaged the neighbours fence and caused them access problems
- The neighbours mains water tap is below the proposed side extension
- Any front extension would cause overlooking of adjoining house leading to a loss of privacy
- The applicant has removed pavement to the front of his house
- It is unclear if the side extension is up to the side boundary and would this mean the loss of a boundary hedge.

Town / Parish Comments

Not object.

Waste Collection Services

No issues.

OFFICER COMMENTS

The proposed extensions scheme is very large in relation to the existing two-bed house which is relatively small and narrow. However, the site is within the development boundary and therefore extensions are not unacceptable in principle and there are no restrictions on size under the planning policies for extensions in these locations. The scale of the extensions is acceptable providing they do not harm the appearance of the house or the surrounding area through careful and high quality design and also do not harm the living conditions/residential amenities of neighbours.

The single-storey rear extension has already been built but due to the height, siting and dimensions (i.e. not exceeding 3.0 metres from the back wall or a height of 4.0 metres or eaves height of 2.5 metres), this extension did not require planning permission and has been built under “permitted development” (in accordance with Part 1 Class A of the GPDO).

With regard to the two-storey side extension, despite its scale and width, which doubles the size of the original house, there is ample space to the side of the house due to the wide plot and therefore this would not give the impression of an extended house appearing over-cramped within its site. A gap of approximately 1.0 metre would still be maintained between the extension and the boundary to protect the degree of spaciousness in the street scene. The amended plans reduce the width of this extension and as a result the existing original house would be wider than the extension. This factor, together with other features of the extension including the half-hipped roof, the dropping of the roof ridge below the main roof ridge and also the setting back of the front wall behind the main existing front wall would lead the extension to respect the main part of the house i.e. the existing dwelling and the primary elevation (the front elevation visible from the road). Despite the width of the extension, the particular design would allow it to still appear subservient to the existing house in accordance with the Council’s Space About Dwellings design guidance. Although the ground floor part of the extension would encroach forward of the front wall of the house, this is by an insignificant amount and would not harm the appearance of the house and despite the well defined front building line along this row of houses facing the road, the houses are set back sufficiently enough from the road to avoid the proposed front projection appearing visually obtrusive from the road or upsetting the street scene.

The side elevation would avoid appearing bulky despite the large depth of the extension, due to the detailing of the side and rear gable roof and the addition of secondary windows which would break up a large expanse of wall.

The amended half-hip roof design and amended fenestration design also compliment the form, design and appearance of the existing house.

With regard to residential amenity, due to the gap between the extension and the adjacent house to the east, the rearward projection would not affect the 45 degree lines measured from the rear primary windows of the neighbouring dwelling. The side windows of that property, facing the proposed extension are also small secondary windows, the ground floor ones of which are interrupted by a long detached garage between the side wall of the neighbouring house and the side boundary. There would therefore be no significant loss of light to the neighbouring property as a result of the extension and no overlooking concerns from the proposed secondary side windows. The proposed rear bedroom window would allow overlooking of only the rear parts of both neighbouring gardens and this also would not amount to a significant loss of privacy.

A distance of at least 22.0 metres would be maintained between the proposed rear windows and the rear windows of the houses to the rear of the site and this accords

with the Council's Space About Dwelling guidance and would not lead to any harmful overlooking concerns.

The proposed front projection would not lead to a loss of privacy affecting the neighbours opposite the site due to the similar separation distances between opposing windows and there are no side windows proposed for the front projection which would face the neighbours to the west so therefore no loss of privacy would result.

There is ample parking space to the front of the dwelling for the parking of at least three cars together with sufficient turning space which is in accordance with Council off-road parking standards relating to 4-bed houses.

In response to the letters of objection, as there would be a gap between the extension and side boundary there would be no impact on the side boundary hedge. The matter relating to the rear extension already being built has been explained near the start of the report. The issues regarding the damage to the fence, access during the construction works, the water supply tap and removal of pavement are not material planning considerations relating to the proposed extension but are legal or civil matters to be addressed by the two parties.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The proposal would not harm the visual or residential amenities of the area despite the very large scale in relation to the size of the dwelling. The design is acceptable in this location. The proposal would therefore comply with the Council's Local Plan and the government planning guidance contained in the NPPF.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : APPROVE

Case Officer: Chris Johnston

Recommendation Date: 23.7.21

X *B.J. Haywood*

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council