

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2021/0485
Valid 03/08/2021

40 HALLS ROAD
BIDDULPH

PROPOSED ATTACHED
SINGLE GARAGE

(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 white render detached 2-bed bungalow with a hipped pitched roof. It is one of a row of dwelling which face Halls Road to the south. There are also dwellings opposite on the other side of the road and also dwellings to the rear to the north.

PROPOSAL

This is a full householder planning application for a single-storey side extension to provide a garage to replace a detached garage to the rear. Served by a long driveway running down the side of the bungalow which is where the new garage extension would be located. This would have a matching white render finish and matching tiles. Amended plans were received to show the originally proposed side gable roof replaced with a hipped roof to match the existing hipped roof of the bungalow.

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

SMD/2019/0724: Single-storey rear extension. Approved.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 14.9.21
Neighbour consultation period ends: 14.9.21
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

None.

Town / Parish Comments

No adverse comments subject to neighbour concerns.

Local Highways Authority

No objection.

Severn Trent Water

No objection.

OFFICER COMMENTS

The side extension respects the form, dimensions and height of the bungalow. The change from a side-gable roof to a hipped roof helps the extension harmonise with the design of the bungalow whereas the side gable would have been out of keeping and would have given the bungalow an awkward unbalanced appearance. As the building is small single-storey structure I do not consider that a set back of the front wall behind the main front wall is required as is often encouraged on side extensions to make them appear subservient to the main building. The extension already has limited width and already achieves this subservience. A drop in the roof ridge, also encouraged in the Council's design guidance for side extensions, would also give a more awkward appearance to the bungalow. The walls would be finished with a matching white render so alleviates the problems of trying to exactly match facing brick on an extension flush with the front wall of a building and the dark grey clay tiles of the main roof can also be easily matched for the extension to ensure it appears to blend in with original bungalow.

The extension would face the side wall of the neighbouring dwelling to the west a close distance away. However, the windows on the side of that dwelling are secondary windows and therefore as a single-storey extension with hipped roof, there would be no significant loss of overall light to the neighbouring dwelling. The extension would also not encroach beyond either the front wall or the rear wall of that neighbouring dwelling and therefore the main front and rear windows would be

unaffected. There would also be no proposed new side windows facing the neighbouring property and therefore neighbour privacy would also be unaffected.

It is noted the internal dimensions of the garage are not in accordance with the Council parking standards and that a section of driveway and a larger existing garage would be lost. However, the local highways authority do not object to the proposal as there is enough space for the off-road parking for two vehicles on the remaining section of driveway in front of the garage and this is in accordance with parking standards for 2 or 3 bedroom dwellings.

CONCLUSION

The amended proposal would not harm the visual or residential amenities of the area and therefore complies with the Council's Local Plan and the government planning guidance contained within the NPPF.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : APPROVE

Case Officer: Chris Johnston

Recommendation Date: 28.9.21

X *B.J. Haywood*

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council