DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2019/0324	**5 SHAWE PARK ROAD**	**PROPOSED DEMOLITION OF EXISTING REAR EXTENSION AND CONSTRUCTION OF NEW 2 STOREY REAR EXTENSION**
Valid 23/05/2019	**KINGSLEY HOLT**	**(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)**

MAIN ISSUES

- Design
- Neighbour Amenity
- Street Scene

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

Two storey cement rendered and part brick, clay tiled 'upright' semi in terrace style, the left hand as viewed from the road. There is a garden to the front partly laid to parking and a drive to the left serving a single garage at the rear. Adjacent to the NE boundary outside the property is a short access lane serving the neighbouring property at 1 Shawe Park Road. The rear of No.2 Lockwood Road (at right angles) faces across the rear of the application property.

There is an existing single storey rear extension across the NE half of the rear elevation matching a similar arrangement to the rear of the attached semi to the SW.

PROPOSAL

As first submitted, to demolish the single storey rear extension and erect a two storey rear extension across the full width of the rear. This would have a dual pitched roof at right angles to the main house forming a rear facing gable with ridge line set down c.0.75m below the main house roof ridge. The extension would project c.2.0m.

In response to LPA comments, a revised proposal has been submitted in which the width of the first floor elevation has been reduced in its width to take account of the Council's adopted guideline on Space About Dwellings – the 45 degree vertical plane angle for the neighbouring ground floor 'French Doors' bay 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
SS6b Smaller Villages Area Strategy
DC1 Design Considerations
T1 Development and Sustainable Transport

Local Plan Submission Version (February 2018)
SS1 Development Principles
SS1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
SS9 Smaller Villages Area Strategy
DC1 Design Considerations
T1 Development and Sustainable Transport

National Planning Policy Framework July 2018
Paragraph(s) 1 – 14;
Section(s) 4 – Decision making; 11 – Making effective use of land; 12 – Achieving well designed places;

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS
None

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity
Site Notice expiry date: 12th July 2019
Neighbour consultation period ends: 21st June 2019
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments
From the owner and occupier of the attached semi to the SW at 7 Shawe Park Road, objects to the proposed development for the following reasons:

- The adverse effect on the residential amenity of my young family and me by reason of a loss of privacy with overlooking and overshadowing from the proposed 2 storey extension.
- Unacceptably high over-development of the site given the loss of garden land.
- Proposed removal of section of hedge provides safety concerns, with having two small children, and will have a severe impact on residential amenity because of the visual impact of a two storey wall adjacent to our patio doors instead of an established hedgerow.
- The proposed development is overbearing in terms of its appearance compared to the existing rear extension.

Town / Parish Comments
Kingsley Parish Council – no objection

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development
Within the smaller village development boundary – acceptable in principle.

Design and Amenity
The design can be considered suitably sub-ordinate to the extant property. Although the new NE facing side elevation is shown flush with the side of the main house, rather than being recessed as might commonly be required, in this case, given that

the overall depth of the proposal is limited to 2m and noting that the extant side wall is finished in render which can be more straightforwardly matched than brick work, the absence of recessing is found acceptable here.

The recessing at first floor level on the SW side elevation adjacent to the attached neighbour at No.7 is considered essential to achieve acceptable relationship in amenity terms based on the Space About Dwellings 45 degree vertical plane angle for their ground floor rear window. This neighbouring window is in fact a full height French doors set in a bay. The height from which the angle is measured is 2.0m. The 45 degree line is just clipped at about 250mm below the eaves of the extension but this is found minimal in this case noting that the overall projection of the extension is limited to 2m; noting that the neighbour window is set forward slightly in a bay. It is also helpful that the extension is to the NE meaning it will not affect southerly or westerly daylight. On this basis, noting the neighbour concern about overshadowing and overbearing, the issues are found with the amended scheme to fall within accepted limits.

There should be no increased harm to the privacy of the neighbours at No.7. If anything the immediate rear of the house is made slightly less overlooked.

The loss of a section of the privet hedge on the dividing boundary with the neighbour is noted but is largely a private matter subject to 'party wall' terms – assuming it to be planted on the boundary and half to be growing in each property. PD rights would for example allow a single storey rear extension as much as 3m to a height not exceeding 4m. Loss of a section of the hedge would not have a bearing in planning terms.

In their objection the neighbour has questioned the loss of garden amenity in the application property. Scaling from the 1:1250 site plan there would still be c.68m2 of rear garden remaining after the development which just exceeds the minimum policy requirement of 65m2 and is therefore sufficient. The area of rear garden space available to the neighbour would not be reduced.

In terms of street scene amenity there would be no strong views of the side elevation where recessing or a shadow line might commonly be required. The property is well set back from Shawe Park Road whereas the next property at No. 1 abuts the roadside pavement edge and thereby tends to mask views of the application site from the public road. Although there would be partial visibility from Lockwood Road the extension would not be prominent in the street scene here due to the intervening properties on Lockwood Road itself.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The main considerations are, as discussed above, the design relationship to the existing property and the impacts on the amenities of the neighbour especially privacy, potential overlooking, overshadowing and whether in overall terms the scheme could be overbearing and impacts on street scene. On all these points the amended scheme, as discussed, is found acceptable and recommended for approval.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : approve

Case Officer: Arne Swithenbank
Recommendation Date: 29th July 2019

X B.J. Haywood

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council