

‘Church View,’  
New Lane,  
Brown Edge,  
ST6 8TQ  
29/6/2017  
Dear Mrs Jackson,

**Re: Objections against a proposed planning application – details as follows:-**

**Refer No:** SMD/2017/0360.

**Applicants Name:** Mr and Mrs K Sherratt. **Location:** ‘Talgarth’, 5 New Lane, Brown Edge, ST6 8T6.

**Development:** Second storey extension formed over present garage.

**Staffordshire Moorlands Case Officer:** Mrs L Jackson

**Owner Occupier of Immediate Neighbouring Property, ‘Church View’:** Irene Corden

**1.Introduction**

I am objecting strongly to the proposed planning application for a second storey side extension at 5 New Lane, Brown Edge. The proposed extension would have a significant detrimental impact on the amenities and visual outlook of my cottage. This adverse impact will be greatly exacerbated by the unusual siting of the two properties in relation to each other, including the height, close proximity and overbearing nature of the secondary storey element of this proposed extension.

**2. Main Issues**

- a. Design and Visual Impact.
- b. Detrimental Impact on Neighbour Amenities.
- c. Space About Dwellings.

**3. Design Consideration.**

- a. Good Design

The NFFP and the SMDC CSP, DP and HEA documents clearly identify good design principles as ones that ensure new development does not adversely impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties or the local area, its character and sense of place. (NPPF -Chapter 7; SMDC - DP Introduction 1:2; 1:3, D1, HEA appendix 3.) The discussed proposal is in contradiction to this statement.

#### **4. Location of the Two properties in Relation to Each Other**

- a. 5, New Lane is a dormer bungalow that is set back from the road side. The frontage of the bungalow faces the road and the garage is to the left of the main building. The garage has been identified as the base for the proposed secondary storey extension.
- b. 'Church View,' in contrast, is a traditional cottage and like many in Brown Edge is built on the roadside. The front of the cottage overlooks the parking area of 5 New Lane. This can be clearly seen on the map that accompanies the planned proposal.

#### **5. Design Issues of the Proposed Second Storey Extension in Relation to the Cottage. .**

- a. The cottage has only a small garden which the proposed extension will back right up to.
- b. Although the garden is elevated above 5 New Lane, the roof and ridge of the present garage are already visible over the boundary wall at a height of 40cm.
- c. It is along the width of the garden that the gable end of the proposed extension would be built, at a height of 2.30 meters above the top of the boundary wall forming a visible solid eye-sore of a structure.
- d. The final height of the proposed gable roof would be in line with the ridge of the existing main house, giving me a clear indication of the height and imposing nature of the extension.
- e. The distance between my garden boundary wall and the gable of the proposed extension would be at its furthest point only 2 meters, narrowing to 1.10 meter in the middle and a mere 30 - 40 centimetres at the front edge. The front edge of their garage is approximately 2.60meters diagonally from my cottage wall.
- f. The extension would certainly restrict the access to natural light for both my garden and my cottage risking making my dwelling damp and unbearably dark.

#### **6. The Significant Detrimental Design Impact on 'Church View'.**

- a. For the issues identified above the siting, scale, height, and close proximity of the proposed second storey extension would:-
  - (i) impact on the cottage amenities;
  - (ii) be overbearing, overpowering and oppressive,
  - (ii) restrict daylight and sunlight,
  - (iii) block outlook.

#### **7. Conclusion.**

**For the reasons listed above I put forward that the plans for the secondary extension at 5 New Lane, do not conform to the essential design principles set down in NPPF Paragraph 17 or the SMDC Core Strategy policy DC1.**

#### **8. Detrimental Impact on the Amenities of Church View from the Proposed Extension.**

- a. The proposed secondary storey extension would severely impact on the amenities and visual outlook of the cottage and the garden. .
- b. The height and density of the proposed extension would be overbearing on the only small garden and social/leisure outdoor space of the cottage

- c. The siting, scale and extremely close proximity of the extension to the boundary wall of the garden, would severely limit the space between the two dwellings and significantly restrict light.
- d. The increased lack of space between the dwellings and the height, density and close proximity of the extension would have an overwhelming negative visual and physical impact and dominate the outlook.
- e. Whilst the gable end of the proposed extension does not have any windows, it is by its very nature a solid structure in close proximity (minimum distance approximately 30/40 cm) to the boundary wall and would produce a hemmed in and claustrophobic affect.
- f. The extension will be visibly intrusive from both the dining room and master bedroom windows.

## **9. Conclusion.**

**For the reason listed above I put forward that the proposed extension does not comply with Chapter 7 of the NPPF or the SMDC, DC1 and SDP policies of the Core Strategy and Supplementary Guidelines.**

**The building of the extension will have a significant impact on the amenities, and enjoyment of the house and garden of the residents of Church View.**

## **10. Space About Dwellings.**

- a. The SMDC, SPD, identifies the importance of ensuring that adequate space exists between properties in order to protect residential amenities.
- b. The space between the top of the cottage boundary wall and the present slopping roof of the main building of 5 New Lane would be eroded with the proposed extension.

## **11. Conclusion**

**The height of the proposed extension coupled with the erosion of space between the two proprieties would detrimentally impact on the amenities of the cottage and not comply with Chapter 7 of the NPPF or the SMDC, DC1 and SDP policies of the Core Strategy and Supplementary Guidelines.**

## **12. Over Development of Proposed Building Site**

- a. The original host property consisted of a single storey bungalow which comprised of a small lounge, kitchen, 2 bedrooms, a bathroom and a garage positioned to the right of the property. This fitted perfectly in with the surrounding properties.
- b. Subsequent development has included:-
  - (i) a top floor containing 3 bedrooms and a bathroom,
  - (ii) a ground floor comprising of a large lounge, sitting room, bathroom, extended Kitchen and laundry room.
  - (iii) a new single storey garage and laundry room positioned to the left of the property and accessed to the main house through a newly built corridor.
- c. All the new ground floor extensions were to the left of the main property and thus eroded the space between the two dwellings. The elevated position of the cottage garden limited the detrimental impact of the repositioning of the single storey garage and the associated extensions.

### **13. Conclusion.**

**For the reasons I put forward the building of the second storey would result in a cramped form of development that would have detrimental impact on the amenities of my cottage.**

### **14. Preserving Local Distinctiveness**

- a. The importance of sensitive development and good design to maintain a sense of place and the historical and distinctive character of this area are highlighted in the HEA report (2010, appendix 3, pages 24 – 26 )
- b. The traditional cottages around New Lane and Back Lane, of which Church View is one, are identified in the SMDC, HAV report as supporting the historical landscape and character of the area and its unique sense of place.

### **15. Conclusion.**

**I put forward that in line with the NPPF (section 7) and SMCP LPP, SPG and HAV documents and policies, new developments must be sensitive in their design to maintain and reinforce local distinctiveness and the special character and heritage of the area for present and future generations.**

**I put forward that the design of the proposed extension is not sensitive to the traditional character of the cottage and the surrounding environment and therefore damaging to the ‘unique’ and ‘rare’ historical heritage of the area and its sense of place. (HVA appendix 3)**

### **16. References**

- a. SMDC Planning Documents as follows:- ‘Core Strategy Planning Document.’ (2014) (CSPD); Local Development Plan; (2016) ( LDP); Design Principles Document (2014) (D1); Space About Dwellings. (1996) (SPG)
- b. Government ‘National Planning Policy Framework’. (2012) (NPPF)
- c. SMDC ‘Historical Environment Charter Assessment Report’ (Aug 2010, appendix 3) (HEA)

Yours sincerely,  
Irene Corden