

Application No: CH/06/0744 Received: 21-Nov-2006

Location: 90, Lower Birches Way, Rugeley

Description: Change of use of garage into beauty treatment room

Application Type: Full Planning Application

RECOMMENDATION Approve subject to Conditions

Reasons for the Grant of Permission

The proposed development complies in all material respects with the relevant policies in the Development Plan (DP) and (where applicable) Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) comprising:-

DPLB8: Design Principles of New Built Development

SPD1: Car parking standards.

1. G2 Limited Permission - Use
2. A minimum of three car parking spaces shall be available at all times within the curtilage of the dwelling.

Reason

In the interests of highway safety and in compliance with SPD1-Parking Standards, Travel Plans and Developer Contributions for Sustainable Transport.

3. The premises shall not be open for business outside the hours of 9am to 5pm on Wednesdays, Fridays and Saturdays only.

Reason

In the interests of the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and in accordance with Policy B8 of the adopted Local Plan.

EXTERNAL CONSULTATIONS:-

Town Council - Object on the basis that it is changing the property from residential to commercial and that the parking implications will disadvantage other residents.

INTERNAL CONSULTATIONS:-

Environmental Health - No objections.

RESPONSES TO PUBLICITY:-

Site Notice/Neighbour Consults - No responses.

OBSERVATIONS:-

1.1 The application site comprises a detached, 4 bedrooomed property with an integral garage at the end of a cul de sac at the north-eastern extremity of the Birches estate. There are currently three car parking spaces including the garage.

1.2 It is proposed to convert the garage into a room which will be used to give beauty treatments to visiting members of the public, relocating a business which has operated at a hair salon in Rugeley. The use of the premises is proposed on Wednesdays, Fridays and Saturdays, between the hours of 9.00 a.m. and 5.00 p.m., with clients visiting one at a time. There will be one person only working from the premises, which is the occupier of the property. The applicant has stated that a maximum of 10 visits a day will occur, depending on the treatment.

1.3 The principal considerations are parking and the effect of the activity on neighbouring properties. There is sufficient space within the curtilage to the front of the property to accommodate 3 vehicles, although the applicant has shown 4 cars parking in tandem on the drive, this can only be achieved by vehicles extending onto the footpath. The proposed hours of operation are within what may be considered normal working hours. The activities proposed to take place are not considered of a nature to cause any noise and disturbance to neighbouring properties, the movements of vehicles may, however, be in excess of what may normally be expected in a residential cul de sac. On this basis it is recommended that a temporary consent of 1 year is granted in order to assess the impact of the use on the highway.

1.4 Human Rights Implications

The proposals set out in this report are considered to be compatible with the Human Rights Act 1998. The proposals could potentially interfere with an individual's right to the peaceful enjoyment of their property as specified in Article 9 and Article 1 of the First Protocol, however, the issue arising has been considered in detail in the report and it is considered that, on balance, the proposals comply with Local Plan Policy and are proportionate.

Application No: CH/06/0669 Received: 03-Oct-2006
Location: 122, Walsall Road, Bridgtown
Description: Two storey side and rear extension
Application Type: Full Planning Application
RECOMMENDATION Approve subject to Conditions

Reasons for the Grant of Permission

The proposed development complies in all material respects with the relevant policies in the Development Plan (DP) and (where applicable) Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) comprising:-

DPLB8: Design Principles of New Built Development
DPLDCP1: Shopfronts and Advertisements
SPG1: Residential Extensions Design Guide

1. B2 Standard Time Limit
2. D3 Materials to match
3. The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved plans and drawings unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any minor variation.

Reason

For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with policy B8 of the adopted Local Plan.

RESPONSES TO PUBLICITY:-

Neighbour consults - No response.

OBSERVATIONS:-

1.1 The application site comprises an older style detached property on the western side of Walsall Road, with a detached garage to the rear approximately 1.5m from the rear wall of the dwelling. This part of Walsall Road is characterised by similar properties.

1.2 It is proposed to extend the property to the side and rear to provide a fourth bedroom and more generous downstairs accommodation to include a car port with a mono pitch feature to the front elevation, the remainder of the roof to be flat. The extension would retain the same pitch as the existing roof, incorporating an eaves level dormer to the side with obscured glazing, the majority of it extending out from the rear of the property by 4 metres, with one part by 5m. The existing garage is to be demolished. The extension compromises spatial guidelines to an extent in respect of a principle window in the rear wall of no. 120 Walsall Road. The existing garage does similar, consequently it is considered that with the removal of the garage, any loss of amenity would be negligible and on the basis approved is recommended.

1.3 Human Rights Implications

The proposals set out in this report are considered to be compatible with the Human Rights Act 1998. The proposals could potentially interfere with an individual's peaceful enjoyment of his or her property as specified in Article 8 and Article 1 of the First Protocol, however, the issues arising have been considered in detail in the report and it is considered that, on balance, the proposals comply with Local Plan Policy and are proportionate.

Application No: CH/06/0775 Received: 30-Nov-2006

Location: Cannock Wood Farm Cottage, Cannock Wood Road, Rawnsley.

Description: Single storey extension to rear

Application Type: Full Planning Application

RECOMMENDATION Approve subject to Conditions

Reasons for the Grant of Permission

The proposed development complies in all material respects with the relevant policies in the Development Plan (DP) and (where applicable) Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) comprising:-

DPLB8: Design Principles of New Built Development

DPLC2: Dwellings in the Green Belt

DPLC6: Green Belt and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty- Design of Development

DPLDCP6: Space about Dwellings

SPG: Residential Extensions Design Guide.

1. B2 Standard Time Limit
2. D3 Materials to match
3. I3 Additional Fenestration
4. The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the deposited plans and drawings with any minor changes being agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to their implementation.

Reason

For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and details and in compliance with the requirements of Policy B8 of the Adopted Local Plan.

RESPONSE TO PUBLICITY

Near neighbours notified with no letters received.

PLANNING HISTORY

CH/92/0084 Double garage and two storey and single storey extensions Approved 01/04/1992

OBSERVATIONS

1.1 The applicant seeks consent to erect a single storey extension to rear at Cannock Wood Farm Cottage, Cannock Wood Road, Rawnsley. The extension will be 3.25m wide and 4.35m in length, built in line with the rear of the existing property. It will be 3.9m high and will accommodate an extension to the existing dining room.

1.2 The property is located within the Green Belt. Local Plan Policy on extensions to dwellings in the Green Belt is that the combined ground floor area of the extensions should not exceed the ground floor area of the original dwelling by more than 50%. The existing dwelling has been extended in the past with a double garage, two storey and single storey extensions. The combined floor space of the extensions already carried out at the property are approximately 55% more than the original floor space of the dwelling. This single storey rear extension will increase this floor space to 71%.

1.3 However the extension proposed to the property is to be constructed to the side adjacent the nearest neighbouring property which will screen the development as the neighbour property extends further back and therefore it is considered that the extension will not have a detrimental impact on the openness of the Green Belt.

1.4 The extension proposed has been designed to be in keeping with the existing property, with materials to match. The property is not within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, with the proposed extension meeting council design guidance and a condition has been recommended preventing any further windows being inserted in the extension to retain privacy to neighbouring properties.

1.5 It is not considered that the extension will have a significant detrimental impact on neighbouring properties amenity or on the openness of the Green Belt, being in keeping with the scale of the property. No objections have been received so approval is recommended.

1.6 Human Rights Act

The proposals set out in this report are considered to be compatible with the Human Rights Act 1998. The proposals could potentially interfere with an individual's rights to the peaceful enjoyment of his or her property as specified in Article 8 and Article 1 of the First Protocol, however, the issues arising have been considered in detail in the report and it is considered that, on balance, the proposals comply with Local Plan Policy and are proportionate.

1.7 Conclusion

In conclusion, it is considered that the extension proposed would not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties or on the openness of the Green Belt and as such, is acceptable.

Application No: CH/06/0761 Received: 27-Nov-2006

Location: Lloyds TSB Bank Plc, 61-63, Market Street, Hednesford.

Description: New signage scheme incorporating illuminated fascia and projecting signs

Application Type: Advertisement Application

RECOMMENDATION Approve subject to Conditions

Reasons for the Grant of Permission

The proposed development complies in all material respects with the relevant policies in the Development Plan (DP) and (where applicable) Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) comprising:-

DPLDCP1: Shopfronts and Advertisements

1. M1 Period of Consent
2. M2 Advertisements to be Clean
3. M3 Advertisements to be Safe
4. M4 Removal of Advertisements
5. M5 Site Owners Consent
6. M6 Traffic Safety
7. M7 Advertisement - Constant Illumination
8. M8 Degree of Brightness
9. The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the deposited plans and drawings with any minor changes being agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to their implementation.

Reason

For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and details and in compliance with the requirements of Policy B8 of the Adopted Local Plan.

EXTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

Hednesford Town Council – No objections

RESPONSE TO PUBLICITY

Near neighbours notified and site notice posted with no letters of objection received.

PLANNING HISTORY

CH/03/0200 Replacement signage - Approved on 15-04-2003

OBSERVATIONS

1.1 The applicant seeks consent for a new signage scheme incorporating illuminated fascia and projecting signs at Lloyds TSB Bank Plc, 61-63 Market Street, Hednesford. The fascia signage will be 9.1m in length across the frontage of the building and will be 0.685m in height, positioned 2.74m from ground level. The sign will have a white background with blue letters and logo which will be illuminated. The fascia sign illumination levels will not exceed 800cd/m² and this has been conditioned.

1.2 Two projecting signs are proposed at either end of the fascia sign, projecting 0.815m from the wall and will be 0.74m high, internally illuminated. The applicant has stated that the projection sign illumination levels will not exceed 600cd/m².

1.3 The current fascia signs are sited lower down on the building, blue in colour with white lettering. However the new fascia sign and projecting signs will be at the same height as the current signage on the neighbouring units of 57 and 59 (charity shop and hairdressers) within the same row of shops. The block of shops which the Bank is located in is set back from the road, with the betting shop (no.69 Market Street) to the side set further forward so views to the new signage will be screened when traveling down the road (north west to south east direction).

1.4 It is considered that this signage is in keeping with the existing development and will not have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the street scene and no objections have been received so approval is recommended.

1.5 Human Rights Act

The proposals set out in this report are considered to be compatible with the Human Rights Act 1998. The proposals could potentially interfere with an individual's rights to the peaceful enjoyment of his or her property as specified in Article 8 and Article 1 of the First Protocol, however, the issues arising have been considered in detail in the report and it is considered that, on balance, the proposals comply with Local Plan Policy and are proportionate.

1.6 Conclusion

The signage proposed is not considered to have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the street scene, being in keeping with other signage above shops within the Town Centre.

Application No: CH/06/0754 Received: 21-Nov-2006

Location: Asda Store, Avon Road, Cannock

Description: Variation of condition relating to planning application CH/00/0260 to allow opening from 7.30 am to 10 pm Monday to Saturday and 10 am to 4pm Sunday

Application Type: Full Planning Application

RECOMMENDATION Approve subject to Conditions

Reasons for the Grant of Permission

The proposed development complies in all material respects with the relevant policies in the Development Plan (DP) and (where applicable) Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) comprising:-

DPLB8: Design Principles of New Built Development

1. The premises shall not be open for business outside the hours of 7.30 a.m. to 10.00 p.m Monday to Saturday, and 10.00 a.m to 4.00 p.m. on Sundays

Reason

To ensure that the proposed development does not prejudice the enjoyment by neighbouring occupiers of their properties, and in compliance with policy B8 of the Local Plan

EXTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

STAFFORDSHIRE POLICE: No response

INTERNAL COMMENTS

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH:No objection – confirmed that there have been no noise related complaints regarding the premises over last 12 months. Additional opening will have no significant effect on amenity.

RESPONSE TO PUBLICITY

Site notice posted and adjacent occupiers notified. One letter of objection received from the Foundation Governor of St Mary's Catholic Primary School on the following grounds:

1. Congestion along Hunter Road as a result of increased deliveries. The objector draws attention to paragraph 24 of Secretary of State's letter of 13th December 2001, which highlights the impact of the ASDA development on the adjoining St Mary's RC School, and also refers to condition 18, for which amendment is sought.
2. The area is designated as part of the safe routes to school initiative. Proposals will detrimentally affect area through increased traffic by opening earlier.

HISTORY

CH/00/0260 Development of retail store (A1) car parking; development of new community centre and youth centre; amenity park (outline) Approved following call in inquiry 13/12/01

OBSERVATIONS

1.1 The application seeks to amend its opening hours by 30 minutes in the morning from 08:00 to 07:30 from Mondays to Saturdays, which is currently constrained by condition 18 attached to planning consent CH/00/0260. It is not intended to amend the opening hours for Sundays which will remain open from 10am to 4pm.

1.2 The application site is located on the edge of Cannock town centre in an area that is predominantly non residential in character. The nearest residential properties to the site are located opposite the vehicular access to the site on Avon Road and accommodation within the grounds of Chase Academy.

1.3 Customer vehicular access to the site is via Avon Road and there are two pedestrian accesses at the north western and south western corners of the site. Delivery access to the site is from Hunter Road at the north eastern corner of the site, adjacent to St Mary's RC School.

1.4 Environmental Health raised no objection and have confirmed that no complaints have been raised over the last 12 months with noise related incidents regarding the store. They have stated that the additional opening will not have any significant effect on local amenity.

1.5 With regard to the letter of objection, the nearest pedestrian entrance to the store is approximately 65m away from St Mary's RC School and would not materially affect their amenity, particularly as the school would not be in use between 7.30 a.m. and 8 a.m. There is no evidence to suggest that customer traffic for the store contributes to congestion along Hunter Road. Condition 15 states that deliveries can only take place between 7am and 10pm Monday to Saturday and 8am to 1pm on Sundays, and as such deliveries can visit the site prior to the proposed opening hour extension. It is also considered that at 07:30 traffic has already started to increase along Avon Road as a result of commuter traffic.

1.6 Human Rights Act

The proposals set out in this report are considered to be compatible with the Human Rights Act 1998. The proposals could potentially interfere with an individual's rights to the peaceful enjoyment of his or her property as specified in Article 8 and Article 1 of the First Protocol, however, the issues arising have been considered in detail in the report and it is considered that, on balance, the proposals comply with Local Plan Policy and are proportionate.

1.7 Conclusion

In conclusion, it is considered that the opening of the application site to 07:30 in the mornings on Monday to Saturday would not adversely affect neighbouring properties in accordance with policy D2 of the Staffordshire and Stoke on Trent Structure Plan and Planning Policy Guidance 24, and as such is acceptable.

Location: 37, Foxtail Way, Hednesford

Description: Two storey side extension and single storey to rear

Application Type: Full Planning Application

RECOMMENDATION Approve subject to Conditions

Reasons for the Grant of Permission

The proposed development complies in all material respects with the relevant policies in the Development Plan (DP) and (where applicable) Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) comprising:-

DPLB8: Design Principles of New Built Development

SPG1: Residential Extensions Design Guide

1. B2 Standard Time Limit
2. D3 Materials to match
3. The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved plans and drawings unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any minor variation.

Reason

For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and details and in compliance with policy B8 of the adopted Local Plan.

EXTERNAL CONSULTATIONS:-

Town Council - Would present an overbearing aspect to no. 35 Foxtail Way.

RESPONSES TO PUBLICITY:-

Neighbour Consultations - No response.

OBSERVATIONS:-

1.1 The application site is an end dwelling of a row of three, three storey terraced properties off the cul de sac at the end of Foxtail Way. The adjoining property is at a higher level than the application site, the dwellings being separated by a fence between 2 and 3m high. The properties are characterised by a single storey element to the rear which are part of the original dwelling.

1.2 It is proposed to construct a 2 storey extension to the side to provide an additional bedroom and to construct a single storey extension to the rear across the full width of the property including the proposed side extension, to have a hipped roof, and to extend out a further 1.4m than the existing.

1.3 The proposal meets spatial guidelines and the rear portion of the proposed extension will not prejudice the amenity of the adjoining property. The side extension is two storey and set back from the front of the dwelling. It too meets design guide criteria. On this basis, it is considered that what is proposed is acceptable and that the objection cannot be upheld. Approval is recommended.

1.4 Human Rights Implications

The proposals set out in this report are considered to be compatible with the Human Rights Act 1998. The recommendation to approve the application accords with the adopted policies in the Development Plan which aims to secure the proper planning of the area in the public interest.

Application No: CH/06/0773 Received: 30-Nov-2006

Location: 31, Woodheyes Lawns, Etchinghill.

Description: Single storey side extension incorporating front canopy

Application Type: Full Planning Application

RECOMMENDATION Approve subject to Conditions

Reasons for the Grant of Permission

The proposed development complies in all material respects with the relevant policies in the Development Plan (DP) and (where applicable) Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) comprising:-

DPLB8: Design Principles of New Built Development

DPLDCP6: Space about Dwellings

SPD1: Car parking standards.

SPG1: Residential Extensions Design Guide

SPG2: Staffordshire Residential Design Guide

1. B2 Standard Time Limit
2. D3 Materials to match
3. C16 Parking Spaces at Dwellings
4. The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the deposited plans and drawings with any minor changes being agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to their implementation.

Reason

For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and details in accordance with Local Plan Policy B8.

EXTERNAL CONSULTATIONS:-

Rugeley Town Council - Objects on grounds that the proposal comes forward of the building line and appears to be in excess of 50% of the footprint. It is also too close to the neighbouring property.

RESPONSE TO PUBLICITY:-

Adjacent occupiers notified. No comments received.

HISTORY:-

432/78 – extension – approved 18/7/78

CH/89/0258 – 2 storey extension to side and rear – approved 24/5/89

OBSERVATIONS:-

1.1 The application seeks consent for a single storey side extension incorporating a front canopy. Materials would match the existing.

1.2 The site comprises a 2 storey modern semi-detached dwelling with a side driveway, on a cul de sac amongst similar properties. Several neighbouring properties have existing side extensions including a side garage at no. 29 and a canopy and side extension at no. 33.

1.3 The proposed extension would have monopitch roof at the front, continued as a canopy along the front elevation of the dwelling, at the same height and slope as the existing canopy on no. 33 which it would adjoin. It would project 0.7m forward of the existing front elevation. The remaining roof over the side extension would be flat roof construction, and it would project 2.1m to the rear of the rear elevation. The whole side extension would be 2.3 x 11.5m in size. The design meets daylight standards in relation to neighbours' windows and would accord with the streetscene. There is room for the required 2 car parking spaces at the front of the property. In the past a two storey side extension with a similar footprint has twice been approved but not built.

1.4 The site is not within the Green Belt where the restriction on 50% extension of footprint applies, and although the proposal would stand forward of the front elevation it would be no further forward than the garage on no. 29 next door. All the work would be within the applicants boundary, and many of the dwellings along this road have extensions which stand on the boundary.

1.5 Human Rights Act Implications

The proposals set out in this report are considered to be compatible with the Human Rights Act 1998. The proposals could potentially interfere with an individual's rights to the peaceful enjoyment of his or her property as specified in Article 8 and Article 1 of the First Protocol, however, the issues arising have been considered in detail in the report and it is considered that, on balance, the proposals comply with Local Plan Policy and are proportionate.

1.6 Conclusion

Approval is recommended.

Application No: CH/06/0729 Received: 06-Nov-2006

Location: 16, Ashworth House, Cannock Road, Chadsmoor

Description: Conversion of existing maisonette to two 2 bedroom flats

Application Type: Full Planning Application

RECOMMENDATION Approve subject to Conditions

Reasons for the Grant of Permission

The proposed development complies in all material respects with the relevant policies in the Development Plan (DP) and (where applicable) Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) comprising:-

DPLB8: Design Principles of New Built Development

SPD1: Car parking standards.

1. B2 Standard Time Limit

2. The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the deposited plans and drawings with any minor changes being agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to their implementation.

Reason

For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and details in accordance with Local Plan Policy B8.

INTERNAL COMMENTS:-

Environmental Health Advice - No adverse comments. Sound insulation shall be required to accord with the Building Regulations.

Housing - The proposed layouts should be amended to improve space for bedrooms and family life.

RESPONSE TO PUBLICITY:-

Adjacent occupiers notified. 1 letter of objection received on following grounds:-

- No. 14 has been unoccupied for a year with no interest.
- Likely noise transference between dwellings will cause social problems, where living rooms are adjacent to neighbours bedrooms.
- No. 16 should be left as it is, as the conversion could hinder the sale of neighbouring properties.

OBSERVATIONS:-

1.1 The application seeks consent for a conversion of the existing maisonette to two flats. Parking is available within a communal parking area at the rear of Ashworth House.

1.2 The site comprises a maisonette on first and second floor levels above a ground floor shop in a 3 storey modern flat roofed block in the local centre of Chadsmoor. The communal car park accommodates approximately 40 spaces serving the 8 shops and 8 maisonettes.

1.3 The internal layout has been amended in accordance with advice from Housing to enable 2 flats to be provided with appropriate internal space. Sound insulation would be covered by the Building Regulations with which the conversion would have to comply. There is sufficient space available in the car park to accommodate any increased requirements for parking provision. The site is close to existing bus routes and local facilities.

1.4 Human Rights Act Implications

The proposals set out in this report are considered to be compatible with the Human Rights Act 1998. The proposals could potentially interfere with an individual's rights to the peaceful enjoyment of his or her property as specified in Article 8 and Article 1 of the First Protocol, however, the issues arising have been considered in detail in

the report and it is considered that, on balance, the proposals comply with Local Plan Policy and are proportionate.

1.5 Conclusion

The proposal would provide an additional living unit in a sustainable location and approval is recommended.

Application No: CH/06/0774 Received: 30-Nov-2006

Location: 40, Church Road, Norton Canes.

Description: Two storey extension to front, first storey to rear and side, conservatory to rear and new replacement pitched roof to rear

Application Type: Full Planning Application

RECOMMENDATION Approve subject to Conditions

Reasons for the Grant of Permission

The proposed development complies in all material respects with the relevant policies in the Development Plan (DP) and (where applicable) Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) comprising:-

DPLB8: Design Principles of New Built Development

SPG1: Residential Extensions Design Guide

1. B2 Standard Time Limit
2. D3 Materials to match
3. I3 Additional Fenestration
4. The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the deposited plans and drawings with any minor changes being agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to their implementation.

Reason

For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with Local plan policy B8.

EXTERNAL CONSULTATIONS:-

Parish Council- No response.

RESPONSES TO PUBLICITY:-

Neighbour consultations - No response.

OBSERVATIONS:-

1.1 The application site comprises an older, mock Tudor style of dwelling with a gable effect and small dormer window to the front, and a garage attached to the southern side elevation. To the rear are two flat roofed extensions which were constructed over twenty years ago, and which extend along both boundaries, giving a courtyard effect between the two. Beyond this is an extensive garden which looks

out on to fields. The properties either side are similar in style, no. 38, an extended, semi-detached dwelling has been converted into flats.

1.2 The application seeks consent to provide a first floor extension over the garage to the depth of the original dwelling only. On the extension on the north side of the plot, a first floor extension is proposed to provide a fifth bedroom. The existing flat roofs to the earlier extensions are proposed to be pitched. Consent is also sought for a wall to the front and along one side of the curtailage comprising brick work to a height of 1m with brick pillars and railings between. The driveway and frontage to the property is spread with hardcore.

1.3 Notwithstanding the unusual layout of the rear portion of the house, the proposed extensions are of an appropriate design. The adjacent property which comprises flats, will in one instance have a first floor window on the side elevation looking directly at the flank wall of part of the extension. The flat below has a window which currently looks directly onto the same wall. In this regard the proposal fails to meet spatial guidelines, however, in all other respect the proposal is acceptable. Subject to a condition precluding the insertion of any window in the side wall of this part of the extension to prevent any loss of privacy to the occupier of the flat, it is considered that the overall loss of amenity to the occupier of the first floor flat of the neighbouring property will not be so significant as to warrant a refusal, and in all other respects the proposals are acceptable and approval recommended.

1.4 Human Rights Implications

The proposals set out in this report are considered to be compatible with the Human Rights Act 1998. The proposals could potentially interfere with an individual's right to the peaceful enjoyment of his or her property as specified in Article 8 and Article 1 of the First Protocol, however, the issues arising have been considered in detail in the report and it is considered that, on balance, the proposals comply with Local Plan Policy and are proportionate.

Application No: CH/06/0763 Received: 28-Nov-2006

Location: 18, Gorsey Lane, Cannock.

Description: Conversion of existing dwelling into two flats incorporating two storey side and rear extensions and juliet balcony to rear elevation

Application Type: Full Planning Application

RECOMMENDATION Refuse for the following reason:-

1. The proposal involves a side extension to a set of 4 terraces that are distinct in character. This extension would have a detrimental effect on the established character of the area and the visual aspect of the street scene, and as such unsympathetic to neighbouring properties. Therefore the proposal is contrary to Local Plan Policy B8.
2. The proposed side extension will be 2m from the side elevation of 16 Gorsey Lane and will result in an unacceptable loss of light to 16 Gorsey Lane and as such is contrary to the Residential Extensions Design Guide Supplementary Planning Guidance.
3. The proposed first storey rear extension abuts the adjoining boundary of the neighbouring terraced property. The proposal will result in an unacceptable loss of

daylight to the neighbouring property. The proposal is therefore contrary to the Residential Extensions Design Guide SPG.

4. The proposed first floor kitchen window will be only 4 metres from the neighbouring boundary and will result in the overlooking of the rear garden, contrary to the Residential Extensions Design Guide SPG.

EXTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

STAFFORDSHIRE HIGHWAYS: No response - To be given verbally at Committee

INTERNAL COMMENTS

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No objection – recommends conversion to at least minimum standards for noise insulation and avoidance of laminated flooring to reduce noise impact

LANDSCAPE: No objection – requested additional information regarding boundary treatment, landscape proposals, information on the alterations to the existing front garden wall

RESPONSE TO PUBLICITY

Adjacent occupiers notified. Forty Four letters of neighbour objecting on the following grounds:

1. Objects to the removal of established boundary fence, which is understood to be 50 years old, and replacement with a panel and concrete post fence
2. The proposed extensions would result in a serious loss of light to 5 rooms in their property. With a two storey high development less than 2 metres away from 4 side windows. The rear extension would result in a loss of light to kitchen.
3. The parking and access arrangements to side and rear of property will result in increased noise and fumes. The tunnelled archway directly adjacent to the living room and master bedroom will result in reverberation and increased noise levels.
4. Proposed dormer window to the rear elevation will look directly into their kitchen. Rear elevation Juliet balcony will result in overlooking to garden.
5. Conversion into flats may mean 2 working people per property meaning possibly 4 cars leading to parking problems. Bad weather may result in parking under sheltered access adding further problems to privacy, fumes, noise and blocking access for adjoining property.
6. Proposals would be unsympathetic to a unique form of terraces as a block of four.
7. The provision of two dwellings will make the street parking situation worse.
8. Concerns from neighbour of noise impact from additional dwelling at site due to lack of soundproofing between properties.
9. 5 windows and French doors to overlook rear garden of No.20 when currently only one bedroom window and an obscure glazed window.
10. Light reduction from first floor rear extension on living/dining room, kitchen, bathroom and rear bedroom of No.20.
11. Shared access with No.20 concerns over vehicular movements
12. Additional sewage problems

OBSERVATIONS

1.1 The Planning Application seeks convert the property into 2 flats comprising a two storey side extension, a ground and first floor rear extension, with parking provision for 3 spaces to the rear of the curtilage. The proposed side extension incorporates an arched vehicular access way to the rear of the property on top of which is a domestic first storey extension. This extension is set back from the front of the property by 3.2m. The ground floor rear extension involves a simple squaring off of the property with a first floor extension on top of the existing single storey utility room.

1.2 The application site is one end of a set of four, possibly late 19th Century, terraced properties (18-24 Gorsey Lane), which are relatively symmetrical in character, with the two end properties being set forward by approximately 1m from the mid two properties.

1.3 The side extension is subordinate to the existing dwelling being set back 3.2m from the front of the property with a lower ridge height. The proposal extends almost to its existing boundary with No.16 Gorsey Lane and will be 2m away from the western elevation of No.16 which has 4 windows in this elevation.

1.4 The proposed first floor extension to the rear of the premises will extend approximately 3m back from the rear of the adjoining property which in this instance is single storey.

1.5 The application proposes parking provision to the rear of the property for 3 spaces which meets the Council's standards. The 3 parking bays are located in the front portion of the rear garden and 6m from the rear of the property.

1.6 The proposed side extension would unbalance the symmetrical appearance of the block of 4 properties. The side and rear extensions have an adverse affect on light and privacy to neighbouring properties as detailed below.

1.7 With reference to the objections raised by the public. The owner of 16 Gorsey Lane has highlighted that the boundary hedge is in the neighbouring property, it is proposed that this is removed. A detailed landscaping scheme has been requested which is outstanding. The proposed side extension will be only 2m away from the western elevation of No.16 Gorsey Road, which has 4 windows in the elevation. Although these are not the principal windows of the rooms the cumulative impact will result in an unacceptable loss of light. The proposed first floor kitchen window will be 4m from the neighbouring boundary and as such will overlook this properties rear garden, contrary to standards contained within the extensions to dwellings SPG. The proposals meet parking standards set by the Council, however the access archway has no room for passing cars on a shared access. The proposed side extension will alter the street scene and the character of the set of 4 terraced properties, and as such will be contrary to Policy B8 of the Local Plan. The two storey rear extension will have an adverse impact on the rear of the adjoining terraced property through loss of light, and not meeting the daylight standard contained within the SPG with respect to the upstairs rear bedroom.

1.8 Human Rights Act Implications

The proposals set out in this report are considered to be compatible with the Human Rights Act 1998. the recommendation to refuse the application accords with the adopted policies in the Development Plan and the applicant has the right of appeal against this decision.

1.9 Conclusion

In conclusion the application proposals will have an adverse impact on neighbouring properties through the loss of light and privacy and will unacceptably impact the character of the street scene.

Application No: CH/06/0706 Received: 25-Oct-2006

Location: 38 - 42, High Mount Street, Hednesford

Description: 10 flats comprising 1 block of 3 storeys incorporating second floor in roof space with dormers, re-position bungalow approved under

planning permission CH/04/0281 (Resubmission of planning application CH/06/0215)

Application Type: Full Planning Application

RECOMMENDATION Approve subject to Conditions

Reasons for the Grant of Permission

The proposed development complies in all material respects with the relevant policies in the Development Plan (DP) and (where applicable) Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) comprising:-

DPLB8: Design Principles of New Built Development

DPLDCP6: Space about Dwellings

DPLH5: Infill Development

SPD1: Car parking standards.

SPG2: Staffordshire Residential Design Guide

1. B2 Standard Time Limit

2. C16 Parking Spaces at Dwellings

3. D1 Materials - Details Required

4. E3 Landscaping Maintenance

5. E8 Tree Protection

6. Prior to the occupation of any dwelling a Landscape Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall stipulate the future management and maintenance of the proposed and existing landscape features including all trees and hedges within and overhanging the site. The site landscape, following completion of establishment, shall be managed in accordance with the approved Management Plan unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

In the interests of visual amenity of the area. In accordance with Local Plan Policies B8, C8 and C15.

7. F1 Fencing Required

8. I3 Additional Fenestration

9. I4 Obscured Glazing

10. The windows and doors of the proposed development shall be constructed of timber, painted white and set back a minimum of 75mm from the edge of the brickwork around the window and door openings unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local planning Authority.

Reason:

To ensure that the development is of a design sympathetic to the locality

11. The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the deposited plans and drawings (Dated 25/10/2006) with any minor changes being agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to their implementation.

Reason:

For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and details.

EXTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

Hednesford Town Council

Object to the proposal on the grounds that a further 16 vehicles emerging onto High Mount Street will create a traffic hazard in view of the nearby school and the huge amount of on street parking that currently exists.

Highways

Object due to lack of detailed information

S.C.C. Planning Policy & Regulations

No response at time of writing

Police Architectural Liaison Officer

No objection however makes recommendations

Severn Trent Water

No objections subject to conditions

Environment Agency

No comments

INTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

Landscape

No objection subject to further information

Strategic Housing

Make detailed comments about internal fire protection details, which will be dealt with under building regulations.

Leisure Services

No response at time of writing

Environmental Health

No objections

RESPONSE TO PUBLICITY

Near neighbours notified – 5 letters of objection received for the following reasons:-

- The proposed height of the development will lead to a loss of sunlight, overlooking and visual amenity;
The increased traffic that 10 additional flats would create will lead to highway danger, especially to children who attend the local school to the south-west of the site and parents who drop-off and pick-up the children;
- The amount of proposed off-street parking is inadequate for this development and will lead to additional on-street parking on an already congested road;
- The proposal will be out-of keeping with the existing street scene and area in general, as no other developments of this type can be found in High Mount Street.

HISTORY

CH/03/0482 – Residential development (outline) with means of access, approved 27/08/2003.

CH/04/0281 – Residential development, 2 detached dwellings, 1 detached dormer bungalow and 4 semi-detached bungalows and access road, approved 02/02/2005.

OBSERVATIONS

1.1 The application seeks consent for residential development on the former site of 38-42 High Mount Street, now demolished; the site slopes gently down from the road frontage to the rear. Surrounding residential properties are mainly Victorian on High Mount Street and bungalows at the rear and are of varied designs and building lines.

1.2 Outline consent was granted in 2003 (CH/03/0482), for residential development on this site with all matters reserved except means of access onto High Mount Street. Full planning consent was granted in 2004 (CH/04/0281), for the construction of 2 detached dwellings, 1 detached dormer bungalow and 4 semi-detached bungalows with access road. The four approved semi-detached bungalows and access road have been completed to the eastern rear area of the proposal site.

1.3 This proposal will see the re-positioning of the previously approved detached dormer bungalow (CH/04/0281), and the construction of 10 flats comprising one block of three storeys incorporating the second floor in roof space with rooflights to the front and dormers to the rear. The proposed measurements of the block of flats will be 20.2 metres in width, the depth of the main body of the proposal will be 11m with additional bay windows to the front and two protruding stairwells to the rear 5.3m in depth, the height will be 9.4m to ridge, 5.4m to eaves. The proposed flat block will be situated fronting onto High Mount Street 5.4m from edge of footpath.

1.4 In terms of policy, the development is on previously developed land, which is consistent with the policy aims of PPG3. Policy H5 of the local plan states that there will be opportunity for infilling and minor consolidation will be acceptable within existing residential areas subject to the amenity of neighbouring residents and the character of the area not being adversely affected and there being no loss of significant amenity space. Policy D1 of the Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Structure Plan (2002) seeks sustainable forms and patterns of new development and state that development should be concentrated as far as is possible within the fabric of existing urban areas.

1.5 The building containing the flats contains three floors of accommodation but the third floor is in the roof space and the design is similar in scale and proportion to some of the Victorian properties in the street.

1.6 In regards to the letters of objection received; it is considered that the proposal will not detract from the visual amenity of neighbouring properties or the street scene, which has no uniformity in dwelling design. The proposal meets council guidance in terms of daylight standards, and off-road parking provision within the curtilage of the site equates 1.5 spaces per unit which again meets council policy.

1.7 In terms of consultee responses; one objection has been received from Hednesford Town Council, who comment that the proposal will lead to highway danger, further information has been requested by S.C.C. highways and will be updated verbally at committee. No objections have been raised from other consultees in regards to the proposal.

HUMAN RIGHTS

The proposals set out in this report are considered to be compatible with the Human Rights Act 1998. The proposal could, potentially, interfere with an individuals' right of peaceful enjoyment of his or her property as specified in Article 8 and Article 1 of the First Protocol, however, the issues arising have been considered in detail in the report and it is considered that, on balance, the proposals comply with Local plan Policy and are proportionate.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it is considered that the proposal can be developed in accordance with Local Plan Policy, without adversely affecting the street scene or neighbouring properties, therefore approval is recommended subject to the above conditions.

Application No: CH/06/0780 Received: 04-Dec-2006
Location: Doctors Surgery, 62, Hednesford Street, Cannock.
Description: Single storey side and rear extensions
Application Type: Full Planning Application

RECOMMENDATION Approve subject to Conditions

The proposed development does not fully comply with the relevant policies in the Development Plan (DP) and Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) but not in such a way as to cause material harm to amenity at the adjacent property. Relevant policies comprise:

DPLB8: Design Principles of New Built Development
SPD1: Car parking standards.

1. B2 Standard Time Limit
2. D3 Materials to match
3. I4 Obscured Glazing

EXTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

Travel Management and Safety: No objections

South Staffs Primary Care Trust: No response

INTERNAL COMMENTS

Environmental Health: No objections

RESPONSE TO PUBLICITY

Site notice posted and adjacent occupiers notified. One objection received from the Clinical Director of the Melbourne Veterinary Centre on the following grounds:

1. Veterinary located next to Doctors surgery and already face severe problems with car park being used by patients of the doctors. Their signposted spaces used by patients of doctors.
2. Currently 15-17 spaces allocated for a surgery with 8 doctors, which is inadequate and below advised limits. Half spaces used by staff.
3. Extensions to surgery for additional consulting and service areas, whilst not providing additional spaces for patients will cause an even larger problem than the existing arrangements.

Letter of objection from neighbouring dwelling to rear objecting on the following grounds:

1. The extension would reduce the amount of daylight to rear property due to the proximity to rear fence and height difference between doctors and property on Hollyoak Way.
2. Loss of privacy in properties rear garden/house due to 3 new windows in elevation which is in close proximity to the rear boundary.

PLANNING HISTORY

CH/98/0172 Extensions to surgery – Approved at Committee 22/04/98
CH/93/0516 Extensions to Medical Practice Approved 17/11/93

OBSERVATIONS

1.1 The application seeks a single storey side extension and rear extension. The proposed extensions seek to create an additional consulting room and nurse room in the rear extension (with corridor and fire exit), and a treatment room and cupboard to the side extension (with corridor and fire exit). It is stated by the applicant that the proposals are needed to comply with NHS targets and to improve their service to patients. It is understood that no additional employment will be created.

1.2 The rear extension will result in the blocking up of 3 windows whilst 4 new windows are proposed as a result of the development. Consulting room 2 will have no window and it is intended by the applicant to install air conditioning into this room. The 3 new rear windows are located approximately 0.8m away from the rear boundary.

1.3 The rear (eastern) boundary consists of a 1.8m high panel fence behind which are the gardens of 3 storey dwellings on Hollyoak Way. The proposed rear extension will be approximately 11m away from the residential properties on Hollies Avenue. With suitably glazed windows it is not considered that there would be any loss to residential amenity. The rear extension will result in the loss of a square grassed area.

1.4 The proposals for the side extension extend onto land that is currently landscaped with shrubs. It is intended by the applicant that the majority of the shrubs that will be lost will be replanted in a suitable location. The side extension which protrudes to the north will face towards the boundary fence towards the bottom of the garden of the property 64 Hednesford Street, there are no windows proposed in this elevation. The extension will be 0.7m at its closest and 1m at its furthest from this fence. The extension proposes a window facing towards a fence (at 1.8m high) to the rear (east) which backs onto properties on Hollies Avenue, the window is 3m from the fence and is 14.6m from the dwellings.

1.5 The design of the proposed extensions would be sympathetic to the existing building through the retention of its character and it is indicated by the applicant that the materials used will match the existing.

1.6 It is indicated by the applicant that there are 20 No. parking spaces available for the operation of the surgery. It is indicated that all administration and clerical staff park at Wickes. The applicant states that the maximum parking requirement for the practice will be for 4 doctors, 1 physiotherapist and 3 nurses and 16 patients, leaving a deficit of 4 spaces. The applicant indicates that patients park on the allocated veterinary spaces. An objection was raised by the veterinary practice regarding the parking situation at the site.

1.7 Guidance in the Cannock Chase Council SPG for parking standards for D1 uses such as surgeries states the maximum standard as being "1 space for every professional member of staff plus 1 space for every 2 other employees at the busiest times plus 3 spaces for each consulting room or surgery". Applying these standards would require 4 spaces for the doctors, 1 space for the physiotherapist, 3 spaces for the nurses and 3 spaces for each of the 9 consulting rooms at the practice. The application form indicates that there are 9 full time clerical staff. Therefore the total requirement for the practice would be 40 spaces. However, the proposal would not increase the demand for parking over and above the existing situation.

1.8 No objections have been raised by Staffordshire Highways who have stated that there would be no impact on the highway and a refusal on highways grounds would be difficult to sustain. The site is located close to the town centre and has good access to public transport, i.e. a location where a requirement to meet maximum parking standards would not be appropriate.

1.9 Human Rights Act

The proposals set out in this report are considered to be compatible with the Human Rights Act 1998. The proposals could potentially interfere with an individual's rights to the peaceful enjoyment of his or her property as specified in Article 8 and Article 1 of the First Protocol, however, the issues arising have been considered in detail in the report and it is considered that, on balance, the proposals comply with Local Plan Policy and are proportionate.

1.10 Conclusion

In conclusion, the design of the extensions are sympathetic to the existing building and would have little impact on neighbouring properties with the appropriate window treatment. The main issue is the impact that the proposal would have on parking situation at the site and on the public highway. It is considered that these extensions would have no further impact on the parking provision of the site.