DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2017/0371	**72 UPLANDS CROFT**	**PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY**
Valid 01/06/2017	**WERRINGTON**	**SIDE AND REAR EXTENSIONS**
		(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- The impact on the character and appearance of the area and on residential amenity.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The site is within the developed area of Werrington and comprises a modern detached bungalow with a part-brick and part-render finish and which is one of a row of similar designed dwellings facing Uplands Croft to the south. There are other similar dwellings to the other side of the road. Open land lies to the rear (north).

PROPOSAL

The application is for a single-storey "wraparound" extension to the east side and to the rear of the bungalow, spanning the whole existing side and rear elevations. This would have a rendered finish for the walls be almost completely covered with a flat roof apart from a small pitched roof on the front of the side extension and which would have a side-facing gable and a ridge connected to the side-facing roof slope of the existing main roof of the dwelling. This "false pitch" has been added to the scheme as shown on amended plans which also show the insertion obscured glazing in the proposed side-facing bedroom window.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Adopted 2014)

S01 Spatial Objectives
SS1 Development Principles
SS1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
DC1 Design Considerations
T1 Development and Sustainable Transport

National Planning Policy Framework

Section 7 (Design)

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

None.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 18.7.17
Neighbour consultation period ends: 6.7.17
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

None.

Town / Parish Comments

None.

OFFICER COMMENTS

The design would be very similar to a wraparound extension approved last year at No.64 Uplands Croft (four dwellings down the road), a bungalow of the same design as No.72 and the extension was designed by the same architect who submitted these new plans. This was also a flat-roofed side/rear extension with false pitch roof at the front. The flat roofed part of the extension for No.72 would not be harmfully prominent although there are a number of bungalows in the area with more prominent flat-roofed side additions. The overall form, design and materials would not detract harmfully with the appearance of the house or be out of keeping with the area. Although the existing house is predominantly brick, there is a rendered porch to the front elevation and other dwellings in the street display elements of render.

With regard to residential amenity, although the extension would be considerably rearward of the neighbouring bungalow at No.74 to the east, No.72 is on lower ground and the proposed extension would not appear unduly prominent when viewed from the rear garden or rear windows of the neighbour's house, especially as most of the extension would be flat-roofed. For this reason it would not lead to a loss of light and the 45-degree lines measured from the rear windows of No.74 are already broken by an existing side/rear detached garage at No.72 which would be removed and replaced by the extension. There would be no further rearward encroachment beyond the current garage. The proposed extension would not significantly project further rearward of No.70 to the west which is already set further to the rear of the existing dwelling at No.72.

Of greater concern, is a proposed side-facing bedroom window which would directly face the rear garden of No.74 a short distance away. There is only a simple low timber shiplap fence separating the two properties (this appears to be within the ownership of No.74) and despite the difference in ground levels, the top part of the window is still likely to exceed the height of the fence when measured from the ground level at No.72 and due to the increased ground level at No.74, this increases the scope to overlook into No.74. It would be possible to view into much of the rear glazing windows at No.74. There is also the perception of being overlooked due to

the close distance between the proposed bedroom window and the rear garden (approx 1.0 metre). As the bedroom would not be the main bedroom for the resultant two-bedroom dwelling, I do not consider it unreasonable that obscured glazing be inserted into the window to prevent overlooking and reduce the perception of a loss of privacy. The applicant has agreed to this and it can be added by way of a planning condition.

The other side-facing windows would view directly onto the blank side wall of No.74 and are not a concern. There are no side-facing windows at No.70 which would face the proposed extension and there are therefore no light loss concerns affecting the other neighbouring property.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

To conclude, the proposal as amended would not result in any harm to the character and appearance of the area or to residential amenity.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : APPROVE

Case Officer: Chris Johnston
Recommendation Date: 27.7.17

X B.J. Haywood

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council