

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2021/0409
Valid 23/06/2021

44 PORTLAND DRIVE
BIDDULPH

SINGLE STOREY SIDE AND
REAR EXTENSION

(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 and to the north of the town centre and comprises a small modern brick-and-tile bungalow at the end of a short cul-de-sac off Portland Drive which lies to the east. There is a similar bungalow to one side to the south and another to the north-east side which lies fairly perpendicular to the bungalow on site. Open land lies to the west of the site to the rear.

PROPOSAL

This is full householder planning application for large single-storey extensions to the rear and to the north-east side which would enlarge the current 2-bed bungalow into a 4-bed bungalow (or 3-bed and a “study”). Although the bungalow has a brick finish, the proposed materials would be “render”.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Local Plan (adopted 9th September 2020)

DC1 Design Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021)

Section 12 (Achieving Good Design).

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

None.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 18.8.21

Neighbour consultation period ends: 18.8.21

Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

None.

Town / Parish Comments

Recommend approval subject to any valid neighbour planning concerns.

Severn Trent Water

No comment.

OFFICER COMMENTS

The extensions are large in relation to the small size of the bungalow and would at least double the scale of the dwelling. However, the site is larger than the other sites in the area as being a "corner plot" at the end of a cul-de-sac the site tapers out considerably from the road towards both the rear (to the west) and to the side (to the north) resulting in a wide back garden area. The extensions are also to the rear and side and as a result of the size and shape of the plot, would still maintain a significant gap between the extensions and the side and rear boundaries so that the development would not lead to an over-cramped form of development. As they are largely to the rear and in the case of the side extension, set back considerably from the front wall of the bungalow, they would be largely screened from the road. They would also harmonise with the form of the bungalow including roof form with no increase in height and maintaining the pitch angles of the current roof. The proposed finish would be render in contrast to the brick bungalow. However, although there is not much evidence of render elsewhere in the housing estate, the modern 1960's/1970's design of the bungalow is well suited to this sort of finish and is quite common on other housing developments of that era. Therefore it is considered to be acceptable on the side and rear elevations. However, it is considered that the front elevation should be finished in brick to match the rest of the dwelling. Subject to this it would not harm the style, form or appearance of the bungalow which has a fairly simple design.

With regard to residential amenity, there would be proposed side-facing primary windows serving bedrooms. However, due to the perpendicular angle of the adjacent bungalow to the north-east side, the side windows facing this property would in fact face the back corner of the rear garden and would not face windows or much of the neighbouring garden area. The boundary fences in any case screen the property from new ground floor windows and this is also the case with the property to the south where the new bedroom window would also face a garage wing and there also be no overlooking over the boundary fence. As the bungalow on site is also a slight angle to the bungalow to the south, none of the 45 degree lines measured from the rear windows of the bungalow to the south would be affected by the rear extension and this accords with the Council's design guidance and therefore the proposal would not lead to any significant loss of light to the property to the south, particularly as no direct sunlight comes from a northerly direction. The 45 degree

lines from the rear windows of the north-east side dwelling would also be unaffected. The proposal would therefore not harm the residential amenities/living conditions of the neighbouring properties by way of loss of privacy or loss of light provision.

Although the proposal would effectively result in a 4-bed dwelling, there is sufficient off-road parking for three vehicles at the site which is in accordance with the Council's parking standards for dwellings with four or more bedrooms.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

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

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : APPROVE

Case Officer: Chris Johnston
Recommendation Date: 18.8.21

X *B.S. Haywood*

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council