DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2018/0333	**8 COALPORT CLOSE**	**SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION**
Valid 11/06/2018	**CHEADLE**	**TO AN EXISTING DWELLING**
		(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Design
- Amenity

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site comprises No.8 Coalport Close; a two storey detached residential property with associated curtilage. The site is situated within a row of four two storey residential dwellings (Nos. 6, 8, 15 and 17 Coalport Close).

No.8 Coalport Close is typical of this row of properties, in that it is constructed of a red brick with a tiled roof, and has a front elevation defined by a leading two storey gable which projects some 2.5m out beyond the main part of the house, orientated facing westwards onto a public footpath and open area of public space.

The front building line of this row of dwellings is consistent, and as such, the similar form, layout and visual appearance gives the row a very balanced and uniform character and appearance.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks consent for a single storey front extension which involves the 'filling in' of the area between the main house and the front two storey gable, and which also projects outwards beyond the front gable by 1.3m.

The plans show that the proposed extension would span a width of 4.0m with a depth of 3.8m taken from the main part of the dwelling. The extension would have a mono pitch lean to roof, with an eaves height of 2.3m and an overall maximum height of 3.9m.

The proposed extension would serve as a multi-purpose room and hallway, incorporating a large front window in the western elevation and a new side entrance door on the northern elevation. The application form states that the external walls of the proposed extension would be constructed of a red brick and the roof constructed of concrete tiles to match the existing dwelling. The door would be finished in a white UPVC to match the existing fenestration.

A review of the submitted plans (Drawing No: SK-SA-XX-XX-DR-A-0202) has highlighted that the elevations are labelled incorrectly with the north showing as the south and vice versa.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Act 2004 requires proposals to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan taking into consideration any material considerations relevant to the determination of the application.

The local development plan for this site comprises the Saved Policies of the Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan (1998); Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy (adopted 26th March 2014) and any relevant Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD's).

The revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published in July 2018 sets out the Governments planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. As stated in paragraph 2 of the NPPF, the document is a material consideration which must be taken into account in planning decisions.

Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Adopted 2014)

SS1 Development Principles
SS1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
DC1 Design Considerations

Staffs Moorlands 'Design Principles' SPD

National Planning Policy Framework

Achieving Sustainable Development	Paragraphs 11-14
Achieving Well Design Places	Paragraphs 124-127

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

No previous planning history

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 6th July 2018
Neighbour consultation period ends: 2nd July 2018
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

No public comments received

Town / Parish Comments

Cheadle Town Council – No Objection

Severn Trent Water

No objection and no drainage condition required

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The proposed development comprises an extension to an existing dwelling and is contained entirely within the residential curtilage. The site is located within the development boundary of Cheadle and is not constrained by any sensitive statutory designation.

In light of the above, the general principle of an extension to a dwelling in this location is considered to be acceptable, subject to all relevant material considerations; which in this case amount to Design, and Residential Amenity.

Design

Policy DC1 of the Core Strategy states that all development shall be well designed and reinforce local distinctiveness, with development being of a high quality design which respects the site and its surroundings and promote a sense of identity through its scale, density, layout, siting, character and appearance.

The Staffordshire Moorlands 'Design Guidance' SPD states that generally speaking, it will not be acceptable to extend in front of, or along the building line, unless design benefits accrue and neighbours are not disadvantaged.

Paragraph 127 of the newly revised NPPF states that planning decisions should ensure that developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and layout, which are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting.

Extensions which protrude forward of a front elevation are problematic in that they have the potential to disrupt and negatively alter the existing character and appearance of a dwelling and wider street scene.

No.8 Coalport Close is situated within a row of four two storey residential dwellings (Nos. 6, 8, 15 and 17 Coalport Close). Each dwelling is constructed of a red brick with a tiled roof, and has a front elevation defined by a leading gable which projects some 2.5m out beyond the main part of the house, orientated facing westwards onto a public footpath and open area of public space. The front building line of these four dwellings is consistent, and as such, the similar form, layout and visual appearance (which includes a flat roof canopy above the main entrance door) gives the row a very uniform character and appearance.

Whilst the proposed extension is considered to be of an appropriate height, and visual appearance by virtue of the choice of materials, concerns have been raised with regards to the depth of the extension and the encroachment beyond the consistent building line of the front elevation.

When viewed from the public footpath, particularly from the north, this extension would disrupt the rhythm of development and the uniformity of this row of properties, thus appearing as an obtrusive and unsympathetic feature, which has no design benefit, and which fails to respect the existing character, appearance and surrounding environment, contrary to policy DC1 of the Core Strategy, the 'Design Principles' SPD, and Paragraph 127 of the NPPF.

Furthermore, the shallow angle of the roof slope, does not reflect that of the host dwelling and given that it projects beyond the existing front elevation it does not appear subservient to it. In addition, the proposed extension wraps around the front elevation of the two storey gable slightly at eaves level which creates an awkward juxtaposition at the junction between the extension and the existing projecting gable. All of this is considered to represent poor design which fails to respect the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area and fails to accord with the Council's Core Strategy policy and adopted design guidance.

In line with paragraph 39 of the NPPF, which requires local authorities to work pro-actively with the applicant to overcome planning issues, the Case Officer presented these issues to the applicant's agent, advising that the extension would be acceptable if the front elevation were to be set back behind the leading gable, and therefore be subordinate to the main house.

In response to these comments, a 'Planning Negotiations' document was submitted which noted that the row of dwellings were not constrained by any sensitive statutory designation, and that permitted development rights for the property remained intact.

As highlighted within the document, the only development relating to extensions beyond a principal front elevation of a house is a Porch, under the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class D (3m length x 3m width and no more than 3m in height). As such, what can and cannot be achieved under permitted development rights to the rear of a property is immaterial when we are considering a front extension.

Other 'precedent' examples of front extensions within the wider vicinity were highlighted within the document. all of which pre-date both the Staffs Moorlands Core Strategy (adopted 2014), and the NPPF (first published 2012), with the exception of 21 Moorfoot Close, Cheadle (SMD/2016/0222). As with every planning application, there is no such thing as a precedent and each application is determined on its own merits.

Notwithstanding the above, No.21 Moorfoot Close is a semi detached property which shares a partition wall with No.23 Moorfoot Close and is situated within a row of properties No.15, 17, 19, 21, and 23 (as shown at Fig.13 and Fig.14). The map and image of this row highlight that these properties are of a different architectural style, which all have a single front elevation (no leading gable as at Coalport Close). These properties do not have a consistent front elevation building line. The semi-

detached property which makes up Nos.21 and 23 have a front principal elevation which sits some 3.6m in front of the remainder of the row.

The approved extension at No.21 is a 'wrap around' side and front extension. The front portion of the extension which protrudes beyond the existing wall amounts to a width of 2.26m and a depth of 1.3m. The height of this dual pitched roof is 3.3m. This is comparable to the proposed development, which when taken from the main part of the house, results in a total width of 4.0m, a depth of 3.8m, and a height of 3.9m. The two extensions are not therefore comparable, as they are situated within a different context and comprise different designs.

In line with paragraph 39 of the NPPF , the Case Officer has advised the applicant's agent to explore alternative extensions to the house at the rear of the property, which could include utilising permitted development rights, in order to achieve the applicant's needs of an increased living space. However, the applicant has chosen to accept a determination based on the submitted scheme.

In assessing the scheme, it is concluded that the proposed extension, by virtue of its siting, scale, layout and massing, and by encroaching beyond a consistent building line, will disrupt the rhythm of development and, given its prominence, would result in significant adverse harm to the overall character and appearance of the street scene; contrary to policy DC1 of the Core Strategy, the 'Design Principles' SPD, and paragraph 127 of the NPPF.

Amenity

Policy DC1 of the adopted core strategy states that new development should protect the amenity of the area, including residential amenity, in terms of satisfactory daylight, sunlight, outlook, and privacy.

The proposed extension includes a single window in the front elevation and a side entrance door. It is not considered that the introduction of this extension would result in any adverse harm to any aspect of neighbouring residential amenity set out within policy DC1.

Notwithstanding the above, the fact that there would be no adverse harm to residential amenity does not mitigate or outweigh the significant adverse harm to the character and appearance of the street scene, by virtue of its poor and unsympathetic design.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

Policy SS1a of the adopted core strategy reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Paragraph 11 of the NPPF sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision taking, this means approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or, where there are no

relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission, unless:

- the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or

- any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.

The general principle of a householder extension in this location is considered to be acceptable as the site is located within the development boundary and is not constrained by any restrictive policy areas.

An assessment of the application has concluded that the proposed extension would encroach beyond a front elevation and consistent building line in a prominent visible location. The extension would disrupt the rhythm and uniformity of the row of properties and appear as an obtrusive and unsympathetic feature. In addition, the shallow roof pitch, degree of projection and awkward junction between the extension and projecting 2 storey gable represent a poor design which does not respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and does not appear subservient to it. It therefore fails to respect the existing character and appearance of the area and thereby contribute positively to its surroundings; contrary to policy DC1 of the adopted Core Strategy, the 'Design Principles' SPD, and paragraph 127 of the NPPF.

In conclusion, for the reasons stated above, the application fails to accord with relevant local development plan policies and other material considerations, which includes relevant supplementary guidance and the NPPF. The application is therefore considered to constitute an unsustainable form of development and in line with policy SS1a of the Core Strategy and paragraph 11 of the NPPF is recommended for refusal.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Refusal

Case Officer: James Stannard
Recommendation Date: 10th August 2018

X B.J. Haywood

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council