DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2019/0286	**123 HIGH LANE**	**FIRST FLOOR SIDE**
Valid 07/05/2019	**BROWN EDGE**	**EXTENSION**
		(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

.

The impact on the character and appearance of the area.
The impact on residential amenity/living conditions of neighbours.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The site is within the development boundary of Brown Edge and lies a short-distance to the south-west of the centre of the village. It comprises a typical 1930's brick-and-tile (rendered over) semi-detached dwelling which faces High Lane (a "B" classified main road leading out of the village towards Stoke) to the south-east. Other dwellings lie either side of the site including a recently built chalet-bungalow to the north-east although most other houses facing this part of the road are a similar style to the one on site including the row of dwellings on the other side of the road, opposite. The land to the rear is open and drops down steeply through a strip of woodland to open fields. The land also falls down towards the south-west so the neighbouring new dwelling to the north-east side lies on slightly higher ground. The house appears to have recently been extended to the rear at two-storey height and this currently has facing breezeblocks. A breezeblock single garage with pitched roof also lies next to the side boundary in the rear garden.

PROPOSAL

This a full householder planning application for a two-storey side extension although described as a first-floor side extension as it involves two new bedrooms supported by brick columns to provide an "undercroft" driveway through to the rear detached garage. The structure would have a flat roof with a felt finish. The walls would have a render finish to match the original house. The back wall would be flush with the rear wall of the two-storey rear extension. The front wall would be set back 0.7 metres behind the main front wall of the house. The extension would leave a maximum gap of 0.2 metres with the side boundary.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Adopted 2014)

DC1 Design Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework

Sections 7 (Design)

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 is ongoing in order to determine whether the Local Plan is sound and legally compliant. Hearing sessions were conducted in October 2018 and the Inspector issued his initial post-hearing advice in January 2019 which set out some actions for the Council and a range of modifications that would be necessary to make the plan sound. The full schedule of modifications is to be determined and will be subject to consultation in due course. The Inspector will then be in position to write his final report. Subject to the findings of the appointed Inspector, the Local Plan can then be adopted by the Council. This will be towards the end of 2019 at the earliest. Upon adoption, ~~it~~ the Local Plan 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 are considered to be relevant to this application:

DC1 Design Considerations

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

No relevant previous applications.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 2.7.19
Neighbour consultation period ends: 2.7.19
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

None.

Town / Parish Comments

No objection.

Severn Trent Water

No objection.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Policy DC1 of the Core Strategy requires development, including house extensions, to harmonise with surrounding development in terms of its design and appearance. The proposal involves a side extension which due to its form and design fails to harmonise with the host dwelling which is a typical 1930's era semi-detached dwelling with hipped roof which is an integral part of its character. The roof of the extension is flat and made of felt which contrasts harmfully with the appearance of the original dwelling. Furthermore, the flat roof would be above the roof eaves of the house giving the extension an even more obscure appearance. This would also fail to make the extension appear subservient to the dwelling and the set-back of 0.7 metres would fail to alleviate this visual impact. There would also appear to be front

and rear barge boards which are also out of keeping with the eaves detail of the original house. The windows would also be above the height of the existing first-floor windows which is also unsympathetic to the design and appearance of the dwelling.

There are no other similar examples of this form of extension in the street scene. I consider the structure would not only be out of keeping with the area but would also be a visually obtrusive and incongruous feature of the street scene which is harmful to the street scene and overall character and appearance of the area.

With regard to residential amenity, the proposed extension would not block light to the adjacent chalet bungalow as although it would extend almost up to the side boundary, the windows facing the extension comprise a secondary small side ground window and above this, rooflights which appear to be above the height of the structure. The extension, although set back from the main front wall of the host dwelling, would be slightly further forward of the front wall of the neighbouring dwelling but not to the extent that the 45 degree lines measured from the front windows of the neighbouring dwelling would be broken and this accords with the Council's Space About Dwellings standards. At the rear, the rear wall of the neighbouring dwelling is set considerably rearward of the host dwelling, including its rear extension. The proposed extension would not project any further rearward of the rear extension to the host dwelling and therefore would not affect light provision into the rear windows of the neighbouring dwelling. In terms of privacy, the proposed rear window would serve a bedroom and although this would be close to the side boundary of the chalet dwelling property, views would be restricted into a gap between the rear garage and the side wall and roof slope of the chalet which extends considerably rearward of the proposed window. There would be views into part of the rear garden at the neighbouring property but most of the garden would not be overlooked. I therefore consider the proposal would not result in a loss of light provision or a loss of privacy.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The proposed extension is considered to have a poor flat-roofed design which is harmful to the appearance of the dwelling and the appearance and character of the area mainly comprising traditionally designed buildings with pitched roofs. It is contrary to the Council's recently adopted Design Guide (February 2018) and despite not harming the living conditions of neighbours, would not comply with Policy DC1 (Design Considerations) of the Core Strategy and also contrary to the government planning guidance in the NPPF Section 12 (Achieving Well-Designed Places). The application should therefore be refused planning permission.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : REFUSE

Case Officer: Chris Johnston
Recommendation Date: 2.7.19

X 

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council