DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HNT/2019/0013 **Valid 18/07/2019**	**15 WALLBRIDGE DRIVE LEEK**	**PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION MEASURING 4.5M BEYOND THE REAR WALL OF THE EXISTING DWELLING, 3.5M MAXIMUM HEIGHT AND 2.3M TO HEIGHT OF EAVES** **(HOUSEHOLDER NOTIFICATION APPLICATION)**

MAIN ISSUES

Compliance with the GDPO (2015).

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The proposed site is comprised of a terraced brick and plain clay tile dwelling and its associated curtilage, located in the town development boundary in the Leek West ward. The proposed site is enclosed by surrounding dwellings on Wallbridge Drive and Fernwood Croft, exhibiting relatively close proximity with those neighbouring. To the East of the site lies the Wallbridge Drive highway.

PROPOSAL

The proposed development is a rear single storey extension. The extension will have a maximum height of 3.5 metres and maximum eaves height of 2.3 metres measured externally from natural ground level. It will have a depth of 4.5 metres. Materials used in the construction of the proposed extension would include brick and blue / grey Welsh slate.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Adopted 2014)

GDPO (2015) Schedule 2 Part 1 Class A

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

SMD/2019/0281

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: N/A
Neighbour consultation period ends: 15/08/2019
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

Neighbours have been notified in accordance with the procedure outlined within the GDPO. No neighbour comments have been received.

Town / Parish Comments

N/A

OFFICER COMMENTS

In conformity with the rules stated within the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), the proposed rear extension to the dwellinghouse adheres to the criteria stated by the documentation. Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the GDPO sets out criteria to enable the classification of whether a householder development is permitted.

Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A.1 (a) states that development is not permitted if the use of a dwellinghouse as a dwellinghouse changes. The rear extension will be solely used as part of the living space of the residents to fully maintain its status as a dwelling, thus making it permitted development.

In accordance with Class A.1 (b) of the GDPO, the ground coverage of the building combined with the addition of the rear extension would not exceed 50% of the total curtilage of the dwellinghouse.

Class A.1 (c) and (d) affirm that the height of the roof and eaves of the extension cannot exceed beyond the height of the existing dwellinghouse; otherwise the development is not permitted. As the rear extension is only single storey, the height of the roof or the eaves would not exceed the roof of the existing dwellinghouse.

As the extension would not be constructed on the principal elevation of the dwelling, nor would it front the highway, this would classify as permitted development in compliance with Class A.1 (e.i) and (e.ii).

Under Class A.1 (g), the dimensions of the development are within those permissible under PD, now that the Government has released an amendment to the HNT legislation to remove the time limit for completion from the 30th May 2019. With a maximum height of 3.5 metres and a depth of 4.5 metres measured externally,

the extension would be under the 4 metre height limit and fit within the 6 metre depth limit on terraced dwellings. Therefore, the proposed extension could be brought forward under PD.

The enlarged part of the dwellinghouse does not have more than a single storey and therefore, Class A.1 (h) does not stand applicable to the proposed development.

The eaves of the proposed extension would be a height of 2.3 metres measured externally from natural ground level. As part of Class A.1 (i), although the proposed extension would be positioned 2 metres from the curtilage boundary of the dwelling, the eaves height of the proposed extension would be under 3 metres. Thus, the development would be permitted.

Class A.1 (j) states that the enlarged part of the dwellinghouse can not exceed beyond a wall forming a side elevation of the original dwellinghouse. The proposed extension will only project from the rear elevation of the original dwelling, therefore this rule is not applicable.

With regard to Class A.1 (ja), any total enlargement including the addition of further enlargements to existing enlargements, cannot exceed the 6 metre limit set out in Class A.1 (g). The total measurement of the proposed extension would not exceed 6 metres, therefore meaning that it is permitted development.

The proposed extension would not include the addition of any new ornamentation features such as a verandah, microwave antenna, a chimney or flue or the alteration to the existing roof of the dwelling. Therefore, Class A.1 (k) is not applicable.

The proposed site does not fall within article 2(3) land, therefore Class A.2 does not apply.

In order to accommodate to the conditions raised in Class A.3 of the GDPO, the proposed development would be constructed from materials which would harmonise with the existing colours, textures and materials of the dwellinghouse. In accordance with Class A.3 (a), all proposed materials are set to match those used in the construction of the existing dwelling, including brick and blue / grey Welsh slate.

Due to no neighbour objection being raised within the consultation period given, the necessity to consider neighbour amenity is not required.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

This notification falls within the framework set out within Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A (g) of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015. Due to there being no neighbour representations raised, there is no requirement to consider neighbour amenity, thus the proposal can proceed as permitted development. As a result it does not require planning permission.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : APPROVE

Case Officer: Hannah Hollins
Recommendation Date: 29/08/2019

X B.J. Haywood

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council