

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2023/0030
Valid 20/01/2023

2 OULTON ROAD
CHEADLE

**ERECTION OF A CARAVAN AS
A RESIDENTIAL DWELLING
FOR A DEPENDANT
RELATIVE.**

(FULL - MINOR)

MAIN ISSUES

The principle of development
The Impact on the character and appearance of the area
The impact on residential amenity
The impact on highway safety

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site lies within the development boundary of Cheadle and lies to the east of the town centre on a modern housing estate. It is a corner plot with a detached 2-bed bungalow. It faces Oulton Road to the north but the access is off the end of the Silverstone Avenue cul-de-sac to the west, which enters the rear garden. The land to the south of the site and the end of the cul de sac, is an open field. Similar bungalows lie to the east side of the site and to the north on the opposite side of Oulton Road. There are two-storey houses to the west on the opposite side of Silverstone Avenue. The rear garden narrows towards the rear, around the turning head at the end of the cul-de-sac and then widens again towards the rear boundary to the other side of the turning head. The site is in a High Risk Historical Coal Mining Area.

PROPOSAL

This is a full planning application for a 2-bed caravan/mobile home to be placed alongside the rear boundary in the widened part of the rear garden, which would accommodate a dependant relative of the bungalow residents. It would have a standard caravan design with metal sheeting, a flat roof and uPVC windows. The access, off the turning head, would remain the same. The forms state there would be an increase in spaces from 2 to 3.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Local Plan (Adopted September 2020)

SS7 Cheadle Strategy
H1 – New Housing
DC1 Design Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Sections 5 (Housing) and 12 (Design).

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

SMD/2023/0031: Single-storey rear extension to bungalow. Concurrent application with this application for a caravan. Pending.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 7/3/2023

Neighbour consultation period ends: 7/3/2023

Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

None.

Parish Council Comments

No objection.

Staffordshire County Council Highways

No objection subject to a condition requiring drawings to show the availability of parking spaces for both the caravan and the bungalow in compliance with Council parking standards.

Environmental Health

No objection.

Severn Trent Water

No objection subject to a condition requiring details of drainage.

Coal Authority

No objection.

OFFICER COMMENTS

The site is within the development boundaries and therefore the principle of a new unit of accommodation is acceptable in this location. This particular site is not large enough to accommodate a new dwelling without it appearing as an overcrowded form of development with insufficient outdoor amenity space and harm to the visual and residential amenities of the area. However, what is proposed is a small

caravan/mobile home for a dependant relative of the bungalow owners and in terms of impacts, would be more akin to a family annex rather than a separate unit of accommodation.

Indeed, if the caravan meets the definition in the Caravan Sites Act, arguably it is a chattel rather than a structure and therefore not operational development. If it remains ancillary to the main dwelling in terms of its use, there is no change of use and it could be argued that planning permission is not required. Nevertheless, the planning merits of the case will still be considered in full but the principle is considered to be acceptable.

It would have a footprint of 11.6 x 3.6 metres. It would appear to be fixed to the ground with the ground floor raised slightly above the ground and this would give the structure a height of 2.8m. It would be very well screened from Oulton Road. It would be visible above the side boundaries of 1.8m in height (hedges and close-boarded fences) when viewed from Silverstone Avenue. However, in terms of visual impact it would not be much different to larger than average caravans or motorhomes parked on driveways or within gardens of other properties in the area. In terms of bulk and massing a very similar building could be erected under permitted development rights, and whilst this could not be used as primary living accommodation, the visual and amenity impacts would be very similar.

It would be visible from the fields to the south and from a public footpath running on a north to south axis alongside the eastern edge of the field. This is because there is only a low post and wire fence on the rear boundary and no real screening. I consider a hedge should be placed alongside the south boundary to provide screening as appropriate. This can be achieved by way of a landscaping scheme condition. Overall, due to its form, limited size and height and siting, I do not consider the development would lead to a harmfully intrusive feature of the area affecting its character and appearance.

With regard to residential amenity, there would be a distance of 17m separating the caravan from the rear windows of the neighbouring bungalow to the east. Although the caravan would have north facing main windows, views from them into the neighbouring bungalow would be at diagonal angle and would in any case be blocked by the presence of large outbuilding within the neighbouring rear garden, alongside the side boundary. The proposal would not lead to any harms to the residential amenities of the nearest neighbouring residential properties by way of loss of light provision or privacy.

There is a concurrent application for a rear extension to the bungalow which would restrict the size of the rear garden area. However, if this was approved and built, there is sufficient garden areas to the side and to the front of the bungalow, screened from the roads by a 1.8m side and front boundary hedge and these gardens would be available for both the existing occupants and caravan occupants to use in the interests of their residential amenities and living conditions, provided that conditions are applied to ensure that the caravan remains ancillary to the existing dwelling.

Finally with regard to highway safety, the parking standards require two spaces per 2-bed or 3-bed dwelling. The caravan, with two bedrooms would normally therefore

require two off-site parking spaces. However, it is clear that the caravan is for a dependant relative and that the one parking space shown (excluding the existing bungalow) is sufficient and achievable on the current hardstanding next to the site access. There would also need to be two further spaces for the existing bungalow (even if extended). I consider the space to the rear of the bungalow next to the access is large enough for the provision of three parking spaces in total, even with the proposed rear extension to the bungalow built and that a condition can be added requiring the provision of these in accordance with a site plan to show the size and location of the spaces. It is also worth noting that any excess parking can be accommodated on the adjacent residential streets where there are no parking restrictions. For this reason, due to the nature of the road and cul-de-sac, there is no requirement to provide an on-site turning space for cars as it would not be unsafe to reverse onto or off from the end of the cul-de-sac where the access is located.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The proposal is acceptable in principle with the safeguard of conditions. The proposal would also not harm the visual or residential amenities of the area and would not compromise highway safety.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : APPROVE

Case Officer: Chris Johnston

Recommendation Date: 17.3.23

X 

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council