DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2018/0461 **Valid 17/07/2018**	**20 SCHOOL DRIVE** **OAKAMOOR**	**PROPOSED TWO STOREY AND SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION** **(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)**

MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of development;
- Design/visual impact;
- Neighbour amenity;
- Highways

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site is number 20 School Drive Oakamoor, a two storey terraced property sitting near to the edge of the Oakamoor Village Development Boundary. There are no Listed Buildings within or near to the application site and the property is located just outside of the Oakamoor Conservation Area. School Drive terminates just to the west of the application site. Land levels within and surrounding the site vary greatly. School Drive itself rises in height from the south/south-east and the lengthy rear garden rises towards the rear boundary. The dwelling occupies a very visually prominent location

PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for a two storey and single storey rear extension. The ground floor extension would allow the provision of an open plan kitchen/dining room. The first floor extension would provide a bedroom. The dwelling already has three bedrooms but this scheme would see larger bedroom space being provided as well as a study, relocated bathroom and an ensuite to serve bedroom 1.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Adopted 2014)

SS1	Development Principles
SS1a	Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
SS6b	Smaller Villages Area Strategy
SD1	Sustainable Use of Resources
DC1	Design Considerations
T1	Development and Sustainable Transport

Emerging Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan

National Policy Guidance

Paragraph 48 of the newly adopted NPPF states that:

> "…decision-takers may also give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:
>
> - the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced the preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);
> - the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and
> - the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in this Framework (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).

Local Plan process

The Council agreed to publish the Local Plan Submission Version for representations in February 2018. At this point, the Council agreed that the Local Plan was "sound". Formal representations were then invited from residents, businesses and other stakeholders to provide them with the opportunity to support or challenge the soundness or legal compliance of the Local Plan. This stage in the process followed three previous public consultations since 2015 which had informed the preparation of the Local Plan alongside a comprehensive evidence base.

In June 2018, the Council subsequently agreed to submit the Local Plan Submission Version to the Secretary of State for examination. An examination in public will now be held this Autumn in order to determine whether the Local Plan is sound and legally compliant. Subject to the findings of the appointed inspector, the Local Plan is expected to be adopted in the Spring of 2019. At his point, it will supersede the adopted Core Strategy and become part of the statutory development plan for the District.

In this context, the Council's position on the weight to be given to the policies contained in the Local Plan Submission Version in terms of the three criteria set out in Paragraph 48 of the NPPF is as follows:

- The stage of preparation – the Local Plan is now at an advanced stage of preparation as the Council has submitted it to the SoS for examination
- The extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies – this varies depending on the policy in question. The Officer Comments section of this report identifies the level of outstanding objections to each policy and recommends the amount of weight to be given to them at this stage in the process

- The degree of consistency of policies with the NPPF – given that the Council has submitted a Local Plan that it considers to be sound, all policies are deemed to be consistent with the NPPF.

Emerging Policies

The following policies (including weighting) are considered to be relevant to this application:

SS1	Development Principles (Moderate)
SS1a	Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development (Significant)
SS9	Smaller Villages Area Strategy (Limited)
SD1	Sustainable Use of Resources (Limited)
DC1	Design Considerations (Moderate)
T1	Development and Sustainable Transport (Moderate)

Supplementary Planning Guidance

1. Space About Dwellings
2. Design Principles for Development within the Staffordshire Moorlands. New Dwellings and Extensions to Dwellings.

Supplementary Planning Document

1. Staffordshire Moorlands Design Guide

National Planning Policy Framework

Section(s)

2:	Achieving sustainable development
9:	Promoting sustainable transport
12:	Achieving well-designed places.

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

SMD/2018/0068	Extension to form larger lounge and hall with shower room, bedroom extensions over and rear kitchen/dining extension. Refused.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 28/08/2018

Neighbour consultation period ends: 09/08/2018.

Public Comments: No representations received.

Oakamoor Parish Council: No objections to the application.

Severn Trent Water: No objections to the proposals and no drainage condition required.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

Due to the application site being within the Development Boundary of Oakamoor there are no 'in principle' objections to a domestic extension. The matters to consider in this particular case are those of design, visual impact, neighbour amenity and the potential impact that the development may have upon highway safety.

Design/visual impact

Design and visual impact are material planning considerations. Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), policy DC1 of the Core Strategy Development Plan and the council's SPG and SPD concerning design are all relevant to the decision making process in that they require all development to be well designed whilst taking into account and respecting the site and its surroundings.

This is a second attempt planning application following refusal of application reference SMD/2018/0068 for front and rear extensions. The application now proposes an extension to the rear of the dwelling only; no proposals have been submitted to alter the front of the dwelling.

The application property is unusual in its design in that it does not have a traditional pitched/gable or hipped roof. The four dwellings that make up the short terrace all have shallow, sloping roofs, the highest part of the roof being at the front of the dwelling with the lowest section of the roof being at the back. The terrace has a staggered footprint and some of the properties have been slightly altered. The property immediately to the east of the application dwelling has a small lean-to roof in place of its original flat roof (ground floor only and above the front door and lounge window). Despite the alterations the terrace does have a simplistic character. This application does not propose any alterations to the front of the house and this is welcomed.

The extension would take the form of a two-storey and single storey rear extension. The single storey addition would have a simple lean-to roof arrangement containing a skylight. The two-storey part of the proposal does however raise considerable concern and whilst it would not be overly visible from the public domain, this in itself is not a reason to accept a proposal. The councils design guidance specifies that 'extensions should be subordinate to the existing building so that the original building dominates,' that the size and shape of the extension should respect the height and proportions of the existing house.' The fundamental concern in respect of design is the shape of the new roof and how oddly it relates to the existing sloping roof. The

roof would not tie in neatly with and sit comfortably against the existing house, it would result in an odd arrangement which would destroy the simplistic roof character of the terrace; it has been designed with functionality in mind but unfortunately does not address design considerations. The architect informs that it is not possible to continue with the existing roof slope as the eaves would become too low to allow for first floor accommodation.

Amenity

The staggered footprint of the terrace means that the rear extension will have some impact upon the occupants of the dwellings to either side of the application site. The rear extension would not have any material overbearing impact upon the occupants of number 18 School Drive (eastern side) as the rear wall of the extension would only slightly project beyond number 18's rear wall and no Space About Dwellings standards would be breached.

The development would have more of an impact upon the occupants of number 22 School Drive. The staggered footprint arrangement of the terrace already results in the application dwelling being set back from number 22. The existing rear extension already breaches the 45 degrees angle taken from number 22's nearest rear window but at single storey height only, this is not considered to be problematic. The proposed extension would increase the ground floor projection by a further 1.18m (to a total of 3.0m projection). Whilst the projection distance would go beyond the guidelines of the 45 degree angle, it is noted that the application site is slightly lower in level to number 22 and it is also borne in mind that a 3.0m projecting, ground floor extension could, (subject to meeting other Permitted Development Rights criteria), be erected without the benefit of planning permission. The proposed first floor accommodation would not have any unacceptable impact upon the occupants of number 22 as the two storey extension would be set back from the shared boundary by approximately 1.7m, therefore not having any overbearing impact upon the rear principal windows of number 22.

Parking

The application does not propose any extension to the front of the house and therefore no existing off-road parking space will be reduced. It is typically found that an increase in the number of bedrooms can increase the need for additional parking however support of the application would not see this number increased.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

Whilst there are no objections to the principle of domestic extensions within Development Boundary locations the application proposes a form of development which is unacceptable in terms of design and neighbour amenity impact. The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : Refuse

Case Officer: Lisa Jackson
Recommendation Date: 10/09/2018

X B.J. Haywood

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council