

Church View,
New Lane,
Brown Edge,
ST6 8TQ
26/8/2017

Dear Mrs Jackson,

Re: Objections against amended 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: Proposed second storey extension formed over present garage.

Staffordshire Moorlands Case Officer: Mrs L Jackson

Owner Occupier of Immediate Neighbouring Property: Irene Corden.

Address: ‘Church View’, New Lane, Brown Edge, ST6 8TQ:

1. Introduction

I am the owner occupier of ‘Church View, New Lane and I wish to object to the proposed amended planning application for a second storey side extension at 5 New Lane, Brown Edge. While I appreciate that amendments to the original plans have been made, I still strongly believe that such a second storey extension would have a significant detrimental impact on the amenities and visual outlook of my cottage. This adverse impact would be greatly exacerbated by the unusual siting of the two properties in relation to each other and the height, density, close proximity and dominating and overbearing nature of the second storey elements of this proposed extension.

2. Main Issues

- a. Design and Visual Impact.
- b. Detrimental Impact on Neighbour Amenity.
- 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. Policy DC1 also states that the design should demonstrate respect for the site and its surroundings through its scale, density, layout, siting and appearance. (NPPF -Chapter 7; SMDC - DP Introduction 1:2; 1:3, D1, HEA appendix 3.) The discussed planning 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 located on the right side of New Lane and is set back from the road. It is the top one of five bungalows that were built at the same time. While a number of these properties have had dormer windows fitted they all retain the bungalow characteristics. The frontage of the 5 New Lane faces the road and the garage and associated previous extensions are located to the left of the main building. The garage, laundry room and corridor have been identified as the base for the proposed second 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. The only small garden of the cottage is positioned alongside the left side of the bungalow.

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

a. The cottage only has a small garden which the proposed extension will back right up to.

b. Although the garden is elevated above 5 New Lane, the ridge of the present garage and associated buildings are visible over the boundary wall at a height of approximately 40 centimetres. This measurement would be increased by the raising of the present garage wall as identified in the amended plans.

c. It is along the width of the cottage garden that the gable end of the proposed extension would be built.

d. The space between the edge of the present garage roof and cottage boundary wall at the widest is approximately 2 meters, narrowing to 1.20 meters in the middle, where the ridge of proposed new extension would be at its highest, and a mere 30 - 40 centimetres at the front edge next to the cottage. At this narrowest point it would be possible to touch the guttering of the present roof from the cottage boundary wall.

e. Within the proposed amended plans a new hipped roof is to be formed at an angle of 45 degrees, thus to some small extent limiting the visual impact on the cottage amenities. However, even with these proposed modifications once the measurement of the overhang of the roof tiles and guttering are taken into account, the distance between the boundary wall and proposed new extension would be less than 2 meters and the visual impact still a serious issue.

f. The amended plan indicates that the highest point of the ridge would be lowered very slightly to take in the new adaptations to the roof. Even with these amendments the new gable height would only be approximately 25/35 centimetres lower than that of the main bungalow giving me a clear indication of the height and imposing nature of such an extension.

g. The siting, close proximity and height of the proposed extension would dominate and overshadow the garden and cottage thus restricting access to natural light.

h. The boundary wall that runs along the whole front of the cottage is only 50 to 60 centimetres high. Within the proposed plans there are to be first and secondary storey windows at the front of the extension. The angle of the cottage to the bungalow, and the close proximity of such an extension, indicate that such windows would visually intrude into the dining room and bedrooms of the cottage even if the 45 degree rule was applied. This would seriously impact on the privacy of the present and future residents of the cottage.

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

a. For the issues identified above the siting, scale, height, density and close proximity of the proposed second storey extension would:-

- (1) impact on the cottage amenities;
- (2) be overbearing, overpowering and oppressive;
- (3) reduce privacy;
- (4) to some extent restrict daylight and sunlight through shadowing;
- (5) block outlook.

7. Conclusion.

For the reasons listed above I put forward that the plans for the second storey 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 second storey extension would severely impact on the amenities and visual outlook of the cottage and the garden.
- b. Even with the amendments to the plans the height and close proximity 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 therefore have an overwhelming negative visual and physical impact, reduce privacy, dominate the outlook and produce a hemmed in and claustrophobic affect.
- d. Because of the unusual siting of the two properties in relation to each other the windows at the front of the proposed extension would impact on the privacy of the cottage.

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, privacy and enjoyment of the cottage and garden by the present and future 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. Even with the proposed amendments to the roof, the space between the extension and the cottage and garden would be significantly eroded.

11. Conclusion

The height and density of the proposed extension coupled with the erosion of space between the two properties 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 the 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 separate garage positioned to the right of the bungalow. This fitted perfectly with the original and also the present bungalows on the right side of New Lane.

b. Subsequent development has included:-

(1) a top floor containing 3 bedrooms and an additional bathroom;

(2) a ground floor comprising of an external porch, large lounge, sitting room, bathroom and extended kitchen;

(3) the relocating of the previous free standing garage from the right side of property to the left. The garage then became an integral part of the bungalow with the additional extensions of a laundry room and corridor;

(4) all the latest ground floor extensions have been to the left of the bungalow thus significantly eroded the space between the two dwellings;

(5) the elevated position of the cottage garden limited to some extent the detrimental impact of the repositioning of the single storey garage and the associated extensions but further development would negate this;

(6) the present proposed extension when considered cumulatively with previous additions may result in over development of the bungalow in relation to its original building.

13. Conclusion.

For the reasons I put forward the adaptations to the first storey and the building of the second storey may result in over development in relation to the original building. The second storey proposed extension would also result in a cramped form of development that would have a detrimental impact on the amenities of the 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).