DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2019/0311 **Valid 20/05/2019**	**91 MEIGH ROAD** **WERRINGTON**	**CONSTRUCTION OF TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION, SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND PART DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGE** **(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)**

MAIN ISSUES

- The impact on the character and appearance of the area
- The impact on residential amenity

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The site is within the development boundary of Werrington and comprises a detached dwelling on modern housing estate. It faces Meigh Road to the north amongst a row of similar dwellings which also face the road. The end of Beaufort Road cul-de-sac lies to the rear where there are other dwellings lying perpendicular to the Meigh Road houses and there are further houses lying perpendicular to the road on the opposite side of Meigh Road.

PROPOSAL

This is a full householder planning application for a two-storey side extension (projecting 3.6 metres from the side wall) and a single-storey rear extension which would span the whole width of the house including the side extension and which would project 2.9 metres from the existing rear wall of the house. The plans also show the part-demolition of a garage, reducing it in length.

The amended plans show the front wall of the side extension flush with the front wall of the house, removing a front projection forward of the front building line. The roof ridge and eaves of the side extension have also been dropped slightly lower than those of the main house. A front canopy has been added to the side extension which would be over the proposed main front door (the existing entrance door is at the side of the house). The canopy would span part of the existing front wall of the house. At the rear, the single-storey extension would have a fully-hipped roof replacing the lean-to roof shown on the original plans.

The plans also include the widening of the front parking area to accommodate three cars.

Further amended plans were received on 20.8.19 to show the eaves restored to the height of those currently on the house but with the front wall of the extension

recessed slightly behind the main front wall. Also, the piers of the canopy have been moved to the edge/corner of the canopy.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Adopted 2014)

DC1 Design Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)

Sections 12 (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, 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

None relevant

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 12.7.19
Neighbour consultation period ends: 12.7.19
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

One letter of objection has been received from a neighbour in response to the original plans. The main planning-related points raised are as follows:

- The front projection of the side extension would break a 45 degree line measured from the front windows of the objectors house and would also be visible from them
- Other two-storey side extensions to houses in the street are set back behind the front wall and there would be no objection if the side extension proposed was set back behind the front wall

- The 45 degree lines at the rear windows of the objectors house would be broken by the proposed side extension and single-storey rear extension.

Town / Parish Comments

None.

Local Highways Authority

No objection subject to conditions

Severn Trent Water

No objection.

OFFICER COMMENTS

With regard to the character and appearance of the area, the side extension would result in the house having a similar width at two-storey level to other houses in the street, both original and extended. The side extension would leave a gap of just 0.3 metres from the side boundary but there is a larger gap between the boundary and the neighbouring dwelling and therefore the proposal would not significantly harm the degree of spaciousness in the street scene characterised by detached dwellings placed relatively close together. There are two other two-storey side extensions to nearby dwellings within the row of houses on the south side of the road. Both of these have been set back behind the front wall. The roof ridge has been dropped below the main roof ridge and the front wall of the extension recessed behind the main front wall to the extension appears subservient to the host dwelling, in line with the Council's Design Guide (Feb 2018).

Furthermore, the dwelling, like many of the other dwellings in the road, has a mix of materials including red brick and also "Mock-Tudor" style cream render panels separated by dark timber frames. The side extension would have a matching red-brick finish but which also would contrast with the upper part of the house which has a cream render and timber finish and help identify the extension from the main house. The fenestration, the roof scale, design, form and pitch and also the front gable feature would also harmonise with the existing house. The canopy with timber uprights would also harmonise with the dwelling and not lead to the extension dominating the house. To the rear, the design of the single-storey extension together with the fully-hipped roof form, would not detract harmfully from the appearance of the house, especially as it would not be visible from the road.

The whole width of the area to the front of the house would be hard-surfaced to enlarge the parking area (and with the dropped kerb widened). This is in common with other frontages at nearby properties on the housing estate and would not harm the street scene.

The comments of the neighbour are noted. Revised plans have now been received which show the two storey side extension set back behind the existing front elevation. With regard to residential amenity, the side extension and canopy would not break the 45 degree lines measured from the front windows of the neighbouring house. It would also marginally avoid the 45 degree lines measured from both the first-floor and ground floor rear windows. The rear extension would break the 45 degree line measured from the rear ground floor window. However, this window is within an "undercroft" i.e. covered by a large lean-to roof. Light into the window is already restricted by this, a side wall and a side-boundary fence. The room the window serves also receives light from a primary front-facing window. The roof of the rear extension has been amended so that it slopes away from the side boundary i.e. it is fully hipped. I therefore do not consider that the rear extension would significantly affect the amount of light entering the ground floor of the house to a harmful extent.

There would be no windows directly facing the neighbouring property. There would be an upper floor window which would allow views over a part of the rear garden of the neighbouring property but as this window serves an en-suite bathroom, obscured glazing can be inserted into this. The privacy levels of the neighbouring properties would not be affected by the proposal.

Conclusion

The amended plans would not harm the character and appearance of the area and would avoid harm to the residential amenities/living conditions of the neighbours. The amended proposal would comply with the Council's Design Guide and in that respect would also comply with the Core Strategy and the government planning guidancein the NPPF.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : APPROVE

Case Officer: Chris Johnston
Recommendation Date: 23.8.19

23/08/2019

X

Jane Colley

Signed by: JaneC