

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2022/0250
Valid 16/05/2022

410 NEW STREET
BIDDULPH MOOR

**PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY
SIDE EXTENSION,
RENDERING OF EXISTING
DWELLING AND EXTENSION
TO GARAGE**

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

Impact on the character and appearance of the area

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

A semi-detached bungalow on an elevated, exposed and prominent corner plot. The pair of semis have been constructed from red/brown brick, they have concrete tiles with a roman wave, and white fenestration. However, the applicant's bungalow has been clad in a fake stone façade to the front and side elevation.

The applicant's bungalow is on a corner plot and Alders Road, that has a junction with New Street, flanks the side of the property. To the rear, the dwelling has a flat roof red brick garage that has a driveway access on to Alders Road. The garage is split between two properties – 410 New Street and 1 Alders Road, they each have a half of the building that is built across the boundary.

The bungalow is located within a relatively dense development of houses built, perhaps, in the main, during the 1970s, to make suburban expansion of the 'larger village' of Biddulph Moor. The bungalow, on the east side of New Street, is within a considerable row of other similar bungalows, while on the other side of the street the dwellings are two storey gable fronted properties. Most of the dwellings in the locality have been built using red facing brick and have the Roman wave style roof tiles and largely white fenestration. Some of the dwellings on the opposite side of the road have sections of buff brick that provides contrast between ground and first floor, others in the locality present sections and panels of render or tile cladding within the brick work, but this is limited to decorative detailing where red brick is the dominant material.

PROPOSAL

To extend the dwelling with a modest side extension that would replace a glass porch or sun room, and to extend the width of the garage to the side toward the applicant's bungalow.

It is also proposed to render the whole of the building and the proposed enlargements in a white/off white render and to replace the concrete roman style tiles with smooth grey interlocking pan tiles. All fenestration would be fitted as or replaced with grey frames.

The applicant has responded a criticism of proposed facing render with the following comments:

1. *The tacky fake cladding on the bungalow is not only falling off, but is a totally different colour to the red brick. Not only does it look an eyesore but it has caused dampness and mould in the bungalow especially on the front walls. This will have to be removed, leaving the remaining brick in a poor state. The only way to make good would be to render with modern breathable render. What I do not understand there are many bungalows and houses in that area that 100% white render and are positioned among brick only built dwellings, a few for example. Numbers 45 and 48 Farmside Lane, 137,131,129 Woodhouse Lane, painted white brick 9 Wraggs Lane, so they have already set a precedent and look recent. Therefore why can they but not me?*
2. *There have been erection of all white rendered buildings long before 1950.*
3. *I notice that you do not need planning permission to paint outside your own house, therefore if the rendering is not permitted I could paint all the brickwork, which would not look very good.*
4. *I cannot believe there is an issue, my personal choice is to build a "living roof eco house" as that is not possible I have tried so hard to be sympathetic with the surrounding area, surely removing all that cheap nasty cladding and that flat roof lean-to, which at the moment is a carbuncle on the landscape, has to be the correct decision going forward.*

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Local Plan Document (Adopted 2020)

S01 Spatial Objectives
SS1 Development Principles
SS8 Larger Village Strategy
DC1 Design Considerations
T1 Development and Sustainable Transport

SMDC Design Guide

National Planning Policy Framework

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

None

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 20/06/2022

Neighbour consultation period ends: 20/06/2022

Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

None

Town / Parish Comments

Biddulph Town Council: Awaited

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The property is within the 'larger village' of Biddulph Moor where Local Plan strategy SS8 applies. To meet housing need within the villages the strategy supports well designed householder development that is compliant with design policy DC1 of the Local Plan and the Council's Design Guide.

Design and Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Area

Local Plan Policy DC1 requires all development to be well designed and reinforce local distinctiveness by positively contributing to and complementing the special character and heritage of the area in line with the Council's Design Guide SPD. In particular, the policy requires the development to be of a high quality and add value to the local area, incorporating *materials* appropriate to the character of the area.

The SPD guidance says that "The key to a sensitive approach is to take note of what is there already before preparing the design and to work with the building's character. An extension should respect the dominance of the original building and be subordinate to it in terms of its size and massing. Setting back the new section from the building line and keeping the eaves and ridge lower than the parent building will help"... "New buildings should use facing materials that either match or complement those of the surroundings".

The proposed addition to the side elevation of the dwelling and that of the detached garage would, in terms of size, form and design, comply with the policy and design guide. The addition to the side of the dwelling would be set well back from the frontage, cover little more than half of the end gable, match the roof pitch of the original dwelling, and have a subordinate roof height. It would not be overly dominant or obtrusive, despite its exposed position on the side elevation on a corner plot dwelling. The garage extension would be set back from the roadside and extend into enclosed areas of the plot. However, they should be constructed using materials that compliment or match the surroundings, rather than stand out or jar against them. The conventional preference is that the additions be constructed from a brick that matches that of the original or adjacent dwellings.

The proposed use of the full smooth white render as a complete covering, with its impacts exacerbated by the use of contrasting smooth grey pan tiles and grey fenestration, would in this exposed and prominent position, appear as an oddity that would stand out and disrupt visual continuity and shared identity. The dwelling is within a row of and surrounded by similar dwellings all built from and presenting red brick, with some limited use of buff brick, as the prevailing facing material and it is this that dictates the character, appearance and distinctiveness of the locality. The proposed render and roof tiles would lack, and work against, the tone, texture, and colouration

of its surroundings. This would be contrary to and cause conflict with the Local Plan design policy DC1 and the SMDC Design Guide, cited above.

The existing stone cladding covers the red brick beneath. It is said that the cladding is causing damp, preventing the bricks from breathing. Simply removing the cladding may improve issues of damp on the inside. There is an assumption made by the applicant that the brick would be a poor state beneath and the only way to make good would be to render the whole of the building and the proposed additions. There has been no investigation into the quality of the brickwork underneath nor has the applicant explored any alternative means of using different material in a perhaps more sensitive limited way.

While the cladding may not have been a particularly desirable choice of materials it is of a recessive sandy colour and from distance it has the tone and colouration similar to the buff brick used in some of the nearby properties in the locality. The dwelling does not stand out or jar against the surrounding properties.

The applicant points to other examples where the dwellings have been covered in white render between red brick dwellings. None of the examples are within the immediate locality and they do not appear to have been carried out with planning permission. She also suggests that she could paint the outside of the house without planning permission, but then concedes that this would not look very good and so this does not appear to be a realistic prospect moving forward.

The applicant does not raise matters or considerations that would outweigh the objections and conflict with the development plan set out above.

Amenity

The proposed addition to the side would not present any windows to the adjacent blank facing side elevation on the dwelling on the other side of Alders Road. The patio window in the rear elevation of the side addition would only look onto the side brick elevation of the garage. It would not overlook the neighbour behind. The development would not adversely affect the living conditions or amenity of neighbours.

Highway Safety

The developments would not increase bedroom numbers or consume any of the existing parking provision.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The proposed use of smooth grey roof tiles, grey fenestration and all smooth white/off white render to cover the whole of the existing dwelling, the existing garage, and the proposed enlargements, would not relate well to the prevailing pallet of facing materials within the locality, which is that of mainly red or brown brick, Roman wave tiles and white fenestration. This would make for a dwelling in an exposed and prominent location that is odds with the character and appearance of the streetscene. This would be harmful to patterns of visual continuity and a shared identity and would adversely effect the character and appearance of the area and fail to preserve local distinctiveness. The development, would in these regards, cause conflict with policy DC1 of the adopted SMDC Local Plan (2020) and the SMDC Design Guide.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : REFUSE

Case Officer: Ben Hurst

Recommendation Date: 08/07/2022

X *B.J. Haywood*

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council