

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2021/0416
Valid 24/06/2021

SOUTH VIEW
68 THE GREEN
CHEADLE

APPROVAL OF RESERVED
MATTERS FOLLOWING
OUTLINE APPROVAL
SMD/2019/0671

(RESERVED MATTERS -
MINOR APPS)

MAIN ISSUES

- Design
- Living conditions
- neighbour amenity / living conditions
- highway safety

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

Within the Cheadle Development Boundary and approved for residential development of one dwelling under outline consent SMD/2019/0671, the site for this proposed detached dwelling was formerly a side garden to the double fronted detached two storey and previously rear extended dwelling known as South View (no.68). The width of the plot formed in the former side garden is about 12m and immediately adjacent to the north east is 66 The Green with a narrow side path of c.1m and a characterful and original brick boundary wall. No.66 has its gabled two storey end wall overlooking the site with a series of likely 'secondary' windows. NB no.68 remains extant as an existing dwelling to the immediate west.

PROPOSAL

Detached dwelling – amended plans submitted in response to LPA feed-back on scale and design and on an initial recommended highways refusal. Matters to be determined include appearance, landscaping, layout and scale.

A further revised plan was submitted 5th May 2022 in order to address concerns of over-shadowing of the neighbouring dwelling and in particular a kitchen window in no.68. This plan also was subject to revisions in order to satisfy SCC Highways concerns.

A detailed topographic spot heights survey of the existing site and adjacent neighbouring land and buildings is submitted. Spot heights are also shown on the final proposal drawing 01080 AL(0)20 D.

Facing brick work: Forterra Hampton Rural Blend. Feature stone heads and cills.
Plain clay tile roof, tiled dormer cheeks.

Also submitted is drawing 01080 AL(0)22 A in respect of site landscaping. The site layout revision D (01080 AL(0)20 D) has been revised on points of detail to site landscaping in order to be consistent with drawing 22 A.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Local Plan (adopted 9th September 2020)

SS1 Development Principles
SS2 Settlement Hierarchy
SS5 Cheadle Area Strategy
DC1 Design Considerations
NE1 Biodiversity and Geological Resources
NE2 Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows
T1 Development and Sustainable Transport

National Planning Policy Framework February 2019

Paragraph(s) 1 – 14;

Section(s) 4 – Decision making; 8 Promoting healthy and safe communities; 11 – Making effective use of land; 12 – Achieving well designed places; 15 – Conserving and enhancing the natural environment; 16 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Adopted Supplementary Planning Documents/Guidance (SPD/G):

- Space About Dwellings SPG
- Design Principles SPG
- Design Guide SPD adopted 21st February 2018

Local Plan Supporting Evidence Documents:

- Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment (2008)

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

SMD/2019/0671 – Outline proposed change of use of part single residential plot into building plot with access alterations to existing – approved

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 05.08.2021 and 07.10.2021

Neighbour consultation period ended: 28.01.2022 and 13.06.2022

Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

From the occupier of 68 The Green – next door to the west – “I can see some of the light will be restricted from one of our windows. Could we have some sort of

indication of how much light will be cut out? I'm finding it difficult to visualise from the drawings”.

26th May 2022: Please could you explain how much (if any) light I would be losing from the 2 rear windows within the red dotted line on the attached picture? [LPA responded explaining the significance of the red pecked lines on the drawings and the 45 degree Space About Dwellings guidance.]

The detail of boundary fencing states 1800mm fencing. The problem is their land is higher than mine. Is it possible to keep the 1200mm fence panels outside my kitchen window as they are now? With the gravel boards they already stand at 1780mm, any higher and it would cover all my kitchen window (see photo attached). In response to query from the LPA it is reported by the neighbour: “it measures 1780mm from my property which is 600mm lower than the land where the proposed property will be. If it measured 1780mm from their side it would make it 2400mm high on my side of the property and cut all my light out of the kitchen.”

At 8th June 2022: Please could someone confirm if the proposed building will cut any light out of the windows at the rear of my property?

Town / Parish Comments

Cheadle Town Council – no objections

Staffordshire County Council Highways

Response at 14th July 2022 in relation to latest revised drawing 01080 PL(0)20 B.

- Access was determined under SMD/2019/0671.
- This revised response is based on revised drawing 01080 PL(0)20 B received 1st July 2022. This drawing addresses previous highway reasons for refusal in that it clearly shows usable parking and turning area.
- Visibility splays were conditioned under condition 7 of SMD/2019/0671.
- Details submitted on drawing 01080 PL(0)20 B comply with that condition.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The principle is confirmed acceptable by grant of the outline consent. The main considerations were noted at outline to be the vehicular access positions, amenity implications in terms of garden space for the existing and proposed dwellings and amenity implications for No. 66 in terms of outlook (whether overbearing), light and privacy. These points stand now to be assessed in detail along with design and highways considerations specific to this scheme.

Design including Amenity

Initial LPA feedback on the first submitted scheme was that:

There are two areas of concern with this, (a) it departs significantly from the prevailing character eg introducing a hipped roof and also the fully glazed forward gable and is set far back; (b) it is over large /too far back so that it would have overbearing impact on the neighbouring dwellings especially no.66 which it wld lie south west of. We note the schematic indicative plan of the outline application which is a more appropriate size, for example it would provide for an 11m rear garden length. It wld be helpful to see in any revised drawing how the height profile wld compare with the two adjacent dwellings...

The building now proposed in drawing 01080 AL(0) 21 C is a relatively conventional traditionally derived design of a two storey dwelling providing three first floor bedrooms. The eaves height is shown as c.5m and roof ridge height as c.7.5m. The roof is proposed in 'Marley Ashmore double plain concrete roof tiles'. The exterior walls finish is proposed to be in red brick: Forterra Hampton Rural Blend which can be considered acceptable as sufficiently in harmony with the red brick existing dwellings to either side.

The position within the plot in this latest revision is comparable to that shown in the indicative schematic which accompanied the outline application. The position of the front elevation line is about the same as in the indicative outline scheme. The overall width of the dwelling however would be wider and fills the plot to within c.1.2m of each side boundary. The indicative scheme had shown c.2.3m adjacent to Southview (no.68) and 1.8m adjacent to no.66. The indicative scheme had shown an 11m rear garden depth. In the latest revision the depth is between 13m on either side of a central rear outrigger where the depth reduces to 8.5m. An area of garden of c.100m² is available beyond the rear elevation line of the outrigger. The total rear space is c.130m². Proposed garden size therefore more than meets the minimum 65m² Space About Dwellings requirement.

The latest revised scheme drawing shows by red pecked lines the 45 degree lines setting out the relationship of the proposal to various principal windows of the two adjacent neighbouring dwellings at nos 66 and 68. For the rear facing principal windows of these two properties the red lines show that there are no significant issues. There is a theoretical breach in the horizontal plain in relation to a rear ground floor window of no 66 but this is not a concern in practice as the rear outrigger at no 66 intercepts the sight line.

There are various secondary side windows to nos 66 and 68 – in particular for number 66. The setting back of the proposal means that these windows which are no doubt valuable in providing a sense of light and space are mainly un-obstructed, especially in the all-important south westerly direction.

A particular concern has been a side-facing ground floor principal window to no 68 serving a kitchen (file photo 6088). The relationship and impact for this window is now comparable to that of the indicative scheme. The window faces slightly north of east. The main prevailing light from the south east and south would be unaffected by the development which would stand to the north. In relation to this window the occupier of 68 has however raised concern about the boundary fencing. She says the current fencing has a top height of 1780mm from ground level of no.68 but that this is from a point 600mm lower than the land where the proposed property will be. "If it measured 1780mm from their side it would make it 2400mm high on my side of

the property and cut all my light out of the kitchen". In actual fact the 1:50 boundary detail in drawing 01080 AL(0)20 D shows a fence of height 1880mm therefore slightly higher still. The point raised is understandable though it must be noted that normally a fence of up to 2000mm is permitted in this position (away from a road front). This notwithstanding it would be appropriate to attach a condition to limit the height of fencing along the south west side boundary forward of a point aligned with the north side edge of the kitchen window in question to be not higher than 1.2m measured from current existing ground level of the application site along this boundary (and notwithstanding the GPDO provisions of Schedule 2 Part 2 – minor operations). There is a further consideration that the vehicle turning tracks will bring headlight beams into the widow view and fencing could be a protection from this.

Amenity

It was noted at outline approval stage: Although there is the potential for adverse impact on the amenities to both South View and No.66 it can also be concluded that an appropriate size and position could be achieved. With the points considered under design above the scheme can be considered acceptable in terms of its impacts on neighbour amenity and in terms of the standards of amenity for the proposal dwelling.

Landscaping

Details in drawing 01080 AL(0)22A. The LPA sought confirmation that the existing boundary wall with no.66 is to be retained – annotation added to that effect. The LPA was also concerned to ensure an attractive frontage edge with the roadside pavement commenting there was a need to have definition to the frontage and not just flat openness and that a 1.8m high boarded fence would be too high and stark along the road front. This is found important especially on considering that the front garden is dominated by an expanse of tarmac and inevitably parked cars. The existing wall is c.0.75m but will be removed. The applicant has opted for a low shrubbery and lawn. Chosen plant species (which have not been stated) will need to allow for the 600mm top height limit forward of the visibility splay and will therefore need to be ground hugging.

For the avoidance of doubt a condition should be attached to stipulate that unless otherwise agreed in writing with the LPA any fence or gate that is forward of the dwelling front elevation and in an alignment parallel with the road shall not be taller than 1.2m. The fence detail shows a 1.8m high fence which is too high for this domestic road frontage. No design specification has been provided for gates despite a position being marked on the drawings.

Highway Safety

Subject to the requested conditions the scheme can now be accepted on highways grounds given the SCC Highways recommendation.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

In consideration of all of the above, the scheme as amended in drawing 01080 AL(0)20 D can be recommended for approval subject to conditions along with site landscaping details in drawing 01080 AL(0)22 A.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : **Approve**

Case Officer: Arne Swithenbank

Recommendation Date: 28th July 2022

X *B.J. Haywood*

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council