Geoff Allen associates

planning & development consultants

F.A.O. Mr Benjamin R Hurst BSc (Hons) MRTPI
Staffordshire Moorlands District Council
Moorlands House
Stockwell Street
Leek
ST13 6HQ

Our Ref GTA/472/19 Date 10th March 2020

Dear Ben,

Planning Application for Revised Scheme of Extensions to Dwelling following Refusal of Application SMD/2019/0558
151, Tunstall Road, Knypersley ST8 7AE

Further to our negotiations since the above-mentioned planning application (SMD/2019/0558) was refused in November last year, I am pleased to now submit revised proposals which I believe accurately reflect the conclusion of our discussions.

As the proposals are the first revision of an application for a development of the same character or description on the same site by the same applicant, and the application is submitted within 12 months of the date of decision on the previous one, I understand that no planning application fee is payable. In this connection I would confirm that the correct surname of the applicant is "Gilford" and not as stated in error on the original planning application form "Gilbert". I confirm that the applicant remains the same for both the original planning application referred to (SMD/2019/0558) and that now submitted.

In response to the reasons for refusal advanced in respect of application SMD/2019/0558, and also in response to subsequent advice received from the Case Officer, the following amendments to those proposals have been made:-

- Reinstatement of the brick chimney stacks serving the existing dwelling since these were inadvertently missed off the submitted drawings, the intention is not to remove them;
- Deletion of the discordant full-width bi-folding patio door feature in the proposed rear elevation;
- Deletion of the unnecessary cladding proposed to the front elevation of the extension;
- Introduction of a step back in the side wall of the proposed extension in order to reduce its apparent scale and massing when viewed from Crossfield Avenue;
- Introduction of a hipped ended roof to the proposed two storey side extension;
- Reduction in width of the proposed two storey rear extension so that it would not project beyond the plane of the original side wall of the house;

- Introduction of consequent amendments to the roof plan of the proposed extensions so that a much-reduced width hipped ended roof covers the two-storey rear elevation and a lean-to roof covers the single storey element of the garden room extension.

The proposed extensions are considered to be of a scale, massing and design that are in accordance with the character and appearance of the host dwelling and which would not challenge the dominance of the existing house in any way. The proposed side extension with a hipped ended roof tied into the main roof of the house would reflect the appearance of the similar styled corner house on the other side of Crossfield Avenue and the visual impact of the proposed rear extension has been significantly reduced by cutting back the width of the two storey element in the manner proposed. It is not considered therefore that the proposals would be harmful to either the street scene of Tunstall Road or Crossfield Avenue.

Matching external materials are proposed to be used in the construction of the proposed extensions, including the continuation of the brick plinth which forms a feature of the original house and the use of a smooth render finish.

In conclusion, it is considered that following the significant amendments made to the scheme which was refused planning permission in November, the development does now satisfy the requirements of Policies SS1, SS1a, SS5b and DC1 of the Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy 2014 and the advice set out in the adopted Design Guide 2018.

It is further considered that the proposals represent sustainable development. Paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Feb 2019) explains that where there is an up-to-date development plan, proposals that accord with it should be approved. Where the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, permission should still be granted unless policies within the Framework protecting assets of particular importance provide a clear reason for refusal (this is not the case in respect of the proposals now submitted), or any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole (again this is clearly not so in the case of the proposals now presented for determination).

Having regard to the pre-application negotiations carried out in respect of the revised scheme, to the amendments subsequently made, and to the accordance of the revised proposals with the relevant development plan policies, the NPPF, and the Council's design guidance, it is respectfully requested that planning permission be granted for those revised proposals as soon as may be practicable.

If there are any points arising from the submission which require my attention I should be pleased if they could be brought to my attention as soon as possible within the planning process so that I can deal with them promptly.

Yours sincerely

Geoff Allen