

**STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS DISTRICT COUNCIL  
PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE**

**17 February 2022**

<b>Application No:</b>	SMD/2020/0589		
<b>Location</b>	Oak Cottage, 58 Rakeway Road, Cheadle, ST10 1QH		
<b>Proposal</b>	Single storey extension to dwelling and extension of existing detached single garage to form double garage		
<b>Applicant</b>	Mr. Craig Cartwright		
<b>Agent</b>	Mr Malcolm Sales		
<b>Parish/ward</b>	Cheadle / Cheadle South East	<b>Date registered</b>	9 <sup>th</sup> December 2020
<b>If you have a question about this report please contact:</b> Arne Swithenbank tel: 01538 395578 or e-mail <a href="mailto:arne.swithenbank@staffs Moorlands.gov.uk">arne.swithenbank@staffs Moorlands.gov.uk</a>			

## **REFERRAL**

The application is a Full Householder and is referred to Committee at the request of the late Cllr Richard Alcock (Ward Member) to consider scale, design, impact on street scene and heritage.

### **1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION**

<b>Approve</b>
----------------

### **2. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS**

- 2.1 Detached dwelling built post 2000 aligned end-on to the road, set back more-or-less in line with earlier detached dwellings adjacent to the west. The main front entrance elevation and design front of the property faces east and is at right angles to the road. The adjacent and further neighbouring dwellings face conventionally towards the road. A detached single garage in brick with dual pitched modern tiled roof stands towards the roadside at the front of the property. The front garden garage position is an arrangement not found in adjacent and further neighbouring dwellings. Notably the Grade II\* Listed Mill House stands opposite. Trees protected by TPO line the easterly boundary of the site and a public footpath right of way runs alongside to the east of these.

### **3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL**

- 3.1 There are two parts to the proposal, an extension to the dwelling on its road-facing end elevation and an enlargement to the existing garage. The applicant agreed an amendment to the application description to read

'Single storey extension to dwelling and extension of existing detached single garage to form double garage' in order to accurately reflect amendments that have been made following the initial submission and negotiations with the LPA.

#### **4. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

- 4.1 00/00215/FUL Detached dwelling – approved
- 02/00934/FUL Detached garage – approved
- 05/00419/FUL Two storey side/rear extension – refused
- 05/00796/FUL Rear extension with rooms in roof space – approved

#### **5. PLANNING POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION**

##### **5.1 Local Plan (adopted 9<sup>th</sup> September 2020)**

- SS1 Development Principles
- SS2 Settlement Hierarchy
- SS7 Cheadle Area Strategy
- DC1 Design Considerations
- DC2 The Historic Environment
- DC3 Landscape and Settlement Setting
- H1 New Housing Development
- 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)

#### **6. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT**

##### **Public**

- 6.1 The last consultation expiry date was 13<sup>th</sup> January 2022 (neighbour notifications). Site notice expiry date was 15<sup>th</sup> March 2021.

- 6.2 Representations have been received from 8 individuals / households all raising objections:
- the number of revisions
  - inadequacy of parking space
  - threat to protected trees
  - harm to street scene appearance
  - harm to setting of Grade II\* Listed Mill House
  - not garaging but residential use is anticipated for the extended garage
  - increases frontage development not consistent with the established pattern and alignment of properties generally on this part of Rakeway Road
  - detrimental to maintaining the existing beauty of the area
  - 58 is already an overdeveloped plot
  - will set a precedent for further similar road-front garden applications on Rakeway Road
  - over-bearing on outlook for no.56
  - the house should not be extended forward of its current line as this breaks the pattern of the rest of the nearby dwellings
  - detriment to the outlook and views for residents to the east eg 62 Rakeway Road
  - the area is a semi-rural location, this would spoil the street scene
  - even the now reduced scheme is still a triple garage (04.01.2022)
  - LPA was in agreement with objections raised when being discussed
  - allowing another structure and extension, so close to it and generally out of context with the building line, would break the precedent which most people have adhered to
  - a more practical location would be to the side of the property
  - foundations can be designed with the protection of trees and their roots

### **Cheadle Town Council**

- 6.3 Objects as follows:  
Acknowledges that this represents a third amendment to the proposal under this application but finds the previous responses of objections in terms of the proposed building line, over-development of the site and its proximity to the Grade II Listed Building opposite the development, remained very much valid. Council were also minded to support the many local residents who had objection to this development.

### **SCC Highways**

- 6.4 Consulted – response to be provided.

### **Historic England**

- 6.5 On the basis of the information available to date, we do not wish to offer any comments. We suggest that you seek the views of your specialist conservation and archaeological advisers, as relevant.

### **SMDC Arboriculture Officer**

- 6.6 Response dated 12<sup>th</sup> Jan 2022. Trees protected under Tree Preservation Order (TPO) No. SM.110 are situated along or within the boundaries of the application site.

- 6.7 The extension to the dwelling and the proposed additional garage (both as originally proposed and as most recently amended) would be comfortably outside the Root Protection Areas of the protected trees along the site boundary, and on that basis neither element of the proposal would be likely to have any significant adverse impact on tree roots. A condition requiring temporary tree protection barriers at the edge of the Root Protection Areas for up to the first 3 trees back from the property's road gateway would be appropriate.

## **7. POLICY AND MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS / PLANNING BALANCE**

### **Principle of Development and Main Issues**

- 7.1 Being within the Cheadle Town Development boundary the proposed development would be supported in principle by the Council's adopted Local Plan policies. Neither element of the scheme could be carried out under Permitted Development.
- 7.2 The main issues are design; impact in terms of character and appearance on the street scene; impact on the setting of Mill House, a Grade II\* Listed Building; impact on the living conditions of the neighbours; highway safety and protected trees.

### **Design**

#### Single storey extension to a gable of the dwelling facing the road

- 7.3 This could be considered an awkward extension and therefore poor design in relation to the main gable as it creates arguably a 'cluttered' appearance and introduces a hipped-back dual pitched roof whereas the main dwelling is gabled without a hipped roof. However, this roof style does match the roof style used for dormers to the east side (front) roof slope of the main dwelling. Although the end gable subject of the current proposal is a side elevation in the overall layout of this dwelling, it is the main elevation facing the public road and the extension would be visible in the street scene. It would project 3m and is shown c.3.8m in breadth which is just over half the width of the gable end to which it would be attached. Its eaves height is shown lower and therefore subordinate to the main eaves height of the dwelling. The proposal eaves are shown at 2.5m and the roof ridge at 4.2m.
- 7.4 By reference to the 1:500 scale block plan in the revised scheme now under consideration there would be a 2.5m wide space between the extension and the proposed garage extension. This space is critical to meeting park requirements.

### Extension of detached single garage to form double garage

- 7.5 As first submitted a large triple garage building 9.6m x 7m to ridge height 5.7m was proposed. Following discussions and a series of amendments the scheme now proposed adds a 4m wide second garage alongside the existing garage. The extension would have the same length as the existing garage, shown as 5.87m on the submitted revised drawing (2008/07/06 rev C). Externally the finished appearance would be brick to match the brick of the existing garage and roofing in tiles again to match the existing. The roof would be dual pitched with ridge to the same height as the existing but aligned at right angles to it and drawn to a gable for the elevation facing the dwelling.

### Street scene character and appearance

- 7.6 Whilst there are reservations about the extension to the dwelling as discussed above it is on balance judged acceptable as it is set back from the road and would not be a dominant addition. Although there is a public footpath to the east alongside the property it is separated sufficiently including by vegetation / trees to not be seen significantly from there.
- 7.7 The garage extension as now proposed is in the same mould as the existing garage and is on the inside away from the road. It would form a visible extension, perhaps especially in the approach from the west viewed across the front garden of no.56 but by using matching materials and being no higher than the existing it would not seem out-of-place or character.

### **Heritage impact on the setting of Mill House, Listed Grade II\***

- 7.8 For the Listed Building there is a statutory duty placed on the LPA, under section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, to consider the impact of the proposal on the special architectural and historic interest of the Listed Building affected, and its setting and “have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses”.
- 7.9 In the revised plans, the scale of the developments proposed and their form and position mean that they would not intrude on views of the Listed Mill House. The proposals can be judged neutral in their impacts on the setting and therefore there is no need to weigh in balance any public benefits from the development and the proposal can be accepted in terms of policy DC2 and the NPPF. The statutory requirement to consult Historic England for proposals affecting a Grade II\* Listed Building have also been met without objection being raised.

## **Amenity / Living Conditions**

- 7.10 The main consideration is the outlook and amenity or 'living conditions' for occupiers of the neighbouring dwelling at no.56. Consideration is given here to the enlargement of the garage as this would be visible from no.56. No.56 has principal windows facing to the front towards the road including one serving a kitchen which is at the easternmost end of the front elevation, ie. at a point closest to the boundary with no.58. The proposed garage enlargement would be visible from all the front facing principal windows but would be perhaps most noticeable in views from the kitchen.
- 7.11 Whilst the enlargement to the garage would be visible and noticeable it is not judged that it could be regarded as overbearing or otherwise of such prominence that it would be unacceptably harmful to the living conditions at no.56.
- 7.12 Although no.58 is marginally forward of the front elevation of the neighbour at no.54 and the proposed extension adds a further 3m forward, it would not breach the 45 degree horizontal plane Space About Dwellings assessment in relation to no. 54 and would not be overbearing or otherwise harmful to the living conditions of no.54.

## **Highway Safety**

- 7.13 Confirmation is still to be received from SCC Highways but it appears likely that the scheme will be acceptable in highway safety terms. As a 4-bedroom dwelling, parking is needed for at least three vehicles to meet the LPA's adopted guidance. The extended garage will accommodate two vehicles. A third space should be available between the new side wall of the extended garage and the new outer projection of the extension to the dwelling. The gap scales from plan as being 2.5m in width and the parking guidance would require at least a width of 2.4m.

## **Response to Public comments**

- 7.14 The majority of the points raised have been covered in the above report. Some of the objections were in response to the much larger initial proposal although later responses have tended to re-assert these points. Belief that there is an underlying intention to create additional habitable accommodation would seem less probable in the reduced latest revised scheme. Even so it will be important to attach a condition to require the two garages (and a third space) to be retained as parking to serve 58 Rakeway Road.
- 7.15 A recurrent point raised is the principle of development forward of the 'building line'. LPA reservations about the extension to the dwelling have been discussed in the report and a balanced view reached. Judgement on the garage extension has been made in the context of the existing approved garage. No. 58 has a different layout relative to the road front compared with the more long established neighbouring dwellings and its circumstances and the reasoning in this report do not necessarily transfer.

## **8. Conclusion and Planning Balance**

- 8.1 For the reasons discussed in the report the revised and much reduced (and further revised) scheme is found acceptable and in accordance with the relevant Local Plan policies identified, as well as local and national planning guidance above including those relating to design and amenity. Therefore, in the absence of any other material considerations and having due regard to all other matters raised, including neighbour and Town Council objections, the application is recommended for approval.

## **9. RECOMMENDATION**

### **A. Approve subject to the following conditions:**

- 1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.  
Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 51 of the Town and Country Planning, Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, 2004.**
- 2. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the details as submitted in the application form and submitted specifications and as shown in drawings:  
2008/07/06/C  
2008/07/06/A  
Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the submitted details and approved plans, in the interests of good planning, for clarity and the avoidance of doubt.**
- 3. The external facing and roofing materials shall match respectively in colour, form and texture those of the existing buildings using brick for the walls and tiles for the roofing and there shall be no variation without the prior consent in writing of the Local Planning Authority.  
Reason: To ensure that the works harmonise with the existing development.**
- 4. The additional garage space hereby approved shall be retained as a garage serving 58 Rakeway Road for as long as 58 Rakeway Road remains a dwelling.  
Reason: To comply with NPPF paragraph 108; to comply with SMDC Local Plan Policies DC1 and T1; in the interests of highway safety.**

### **Informative**

- 1. This recommendation is made following careful consideration of all the issues raised through the application process and thorough discussion with the applicants. In accordance with Paragraph 38 of the NPPF the Case Officer has sought solutions where possible to secure a development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area.**

**B In the event of any changes being needed to the wording of the Committee's decision (such as to delete, vary or add conditions/informatives/planning obligations or reasons for approval/refusal) prior to the decision being issued, the Head of Development Services has delegated authority to do so in consultation with the Chairman of the Planning Applications Committee, provided that the changes do not exceed the substantive nature of the Committee's decision**

## **10. APPENDICES TO THE REPORT**

**10.1 The link below to the Council's website is where the detail of this application can be viewed.**

**<http://publicaccess.staffs Moorlands.gov.uk/portal/servlets/ApplicationSearchServlet?PKID=145724>**

