

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2024/0351
Valid 30/07/2024

4 BEECH CLOSE
CHEADLE

**TWO STOREY SIDE
EXTENSION TO FORM HALL
WC UTILITY AND STORE WITH
BEDROOM EN-SUITE OVER.
TWO STOREY REAR
EXTENSION TO FORM
KITCHEN/DINING WITH
BEDROOM AND BATHROOM
OVER FRONT CANOPY WITH
LOUNGE BOW WINDOW**

(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 Cheadle and lies on a modern housing estate to the east of the town centre. It comprises a brick-and-tile two-storey detached 3-bed dwelling which is one of a row of similar designed dwellings which face Beech Close, a short cul-de-sac, to the west. Immediately to the rear is a new-build detached bungalow on a backland plot with an access onto Ashbourne Road to the north.

PROPOSAL

This is a full householder planning application for a two-storey rear and two-storey side extension in place of an attached single garage. The side part would have a similar width as the garage and leave a gap of 0.95m between the extension and the side wall of the neighbouring dwelling to the south. Amended plans were received which set back the front wall of the first-floor part of the extension by 1.9m behind the existing main front wall of the dwelling and the first-floor part would also project 1.2m rear off the existing main rear wall of the dwelling and would be above a single-storey part of a rear/side extension which would project 3.0m rearward of the exiting rear wall, level with the proposed two-storey rear extension which would also span the whole width of the existing house. The scheme would provide three double bedrooms for the house, with the existing single “box room” bedroom at the front being used as dressing room for the existing front double bedroom. The new bedroom at the side would have an ensuite bathroom at the rear.

A front lean-to canopy would also be added spanning the whole frontage including the side extension and also a curved front bay extension to the living room, below the canopy.

The original plans had only a slight recess for the first-floor part of the side extension and no rear projection for the first-floor part i.e. the amended plans push the first-floor part of the side extension rearward.

The extensions would have matching materials to the house i.e. white render on the lower part and brick on the upper storey.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Local Plan (Adopted September 2020)

DC1 – Design Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021)

Sections 12 (Design).

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

None relevant.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 11.9.24

Neighbour notification expiry date: 11.9.24

Press advert: N/A

Public Comments

One Letter of objection has been received from a local resident who considers the proposed canopy would look out of place in the area.

Parish/Town Council comments

None.

OFFICER COMMENTS

In order to protect the character and appearance of the housing estate, it is important to ensure that two-storey side extensions appear subservient to the main original dwelling and also do not compromise the degree of spaciousness which characterises the area which includes detached dwellings separated by gaps. It was considered that the original plans would have led to an overcrowded appearance within the plot by virtue of leaving a gap of slightly less than 1.0m to the

dwelling to the side and that recessing the front wall of the upper storey by 0.3m was insufficient to reduce this impact. The original plans replicate to some extent the side extensions at nos 14 and 19 Beech Close but an approx. 2.0m gap separates those extensions with the adjacent dwellings.

There are a large number of other houses of the same design as the one on the application site at Thorley Drive to the south, some of which have two-storey side extensions but all of these are considerably recessed behind the main front walls, at first-floor level, by at least 1.0m (such as at nos. 51, 60, 66, 67 and 72). The plans were later amended to replicate the side extensions at the above properties. The first-floor has been recessed 1.9m from the front wall. This together with the dropping of the side extension roof ridge below the main roof ridge ensures that the side extension now appears subservient to the original house, in line with the Council's Design Guide.

The proposed canopy and curved bay window is not out of keeping with the area as there are other examples of this addition on the same house design type in the area (e.g no.51 Thorley Drive) and neither the bay window or canopy would project more than 1.0m from the front wall avoiding an over-prominent intrusive appearance in the street scene.

The rear extension would not be easily visible in the street. The roof design of the extensions, comprising both side and rear gables, is appropriate for the dwelling in terms of their form and design and in keeping with the area.

With regard to residential amenity, the extensions would not break any 45 degree lines measured from the primary windows of the neighbouring dwellings (including the first-floor rear projection of the side extension) in compliance with the Council's Space About Dwellings design guidance. The side extension would not project any further rearward of the existing garage at ground floor level. The proposal would therefore not result in any significant loss of light to neighbouring properties and this includes the bungalow to the rear of the site as only the side wall of the bungalow faces the application site and the only windows on this elevation are small secondary windows. The upper floor rooms would not lead to any harmful level of overlooking into neighbouring primary windows or neighbouring rear garden areas (only a rear corner of the No.6 garden would be overlooked by the proposed new rear bedroom window).

The rear extension would reduce the length of the rear garden of No.4 to 8.0m on average, in conflict with the Space About Dwellings SPG. However, due to the width of the plot, the overall garden size would slightly exceed the area threshold of 65sq.m in the SPG and I consider the resultant garden area would still continue to provide an adequate private outdoor amenity space in the interests of enjoyment for the residents/their living conditions and overall residential amenities of the property.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The amended proposal would not harm the visual or residential amenities of the area and would therefore comply with the Council's Local Plan and government planning guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : APPROVE

Case Officer: Chris Johnston
Recommendation Date: 1.10.24

X 

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council