DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2020/0622 **Valid 12/11/2020**	**3 ROWNALL VIEW** **LEEK**	**PROPOSED FRONT SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO FORM PORCH AREA AND EXTEND KITCHEN AND STUDY (BY 1.5M)** **(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)**

MAIN ISSUES

- Design
- Amenity
- Highway Safety

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The proposed site comprises a detached brick, hanging tile and tile dwellinghouse and its associated curtilage, situated in the Leek West ward. The site is within the Leek Development Boundary, where the Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan seeks to concentrate development. The proposed site is enclosed by neighbouring dwellings comprising a section of Rownall View and backs on to the rear curtilage of a section of dwellings on School Close. No. 1 Rownall View lies to the South-west of the proposed site and No. 5 Rownall View is situated to the North-east. To the North-west, the rear curtilage of the site runs adjacent to the rear curtilage of No. 8 and No. 9 School Close. The Rownall View highway runs adjacent to the proposed site on the South-east.

It is noted that a number of properties within the estate have been extended; however the established character of the original estate has been retained.

PROPOSAL

The proposed development comprises a front single storey extension which spans the entirety of the principal elevation. The proposed extension would form a porch, as well as extend the existing kitchen and convert the existing garage into a study. The proposed front extension would project forward of the principal elevation of the original dwellinghouse by 1.5 metres and have a width of approximately 8.06 metres. The maximum height would be approximately 3.46 metres and the maximum eaves height would be 2.12 metres.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan (Adopted 2020)

SS1 Development Principles
SS2 Settlement Hierarchy
SS5 Leek Area Strategy
DC1 Design Considerations
T1 Development and Sustainable Transport

National Planning Policy Framework

Paragraph(s) 1 – 14
Section(s) 4 – Decision making, 12 – Achieving well designed places

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

SMD/2002/1217 – Single / two storey side extension. Approved.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 07/01/2021
Neighbour consultation period ends: 08/12/2020
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

No public comments were made during the consultation period.

Town / Parish Comments

Leek Town Council do not object to the proposed development.

Severn Trent Water

Severn Trent have no objections to the proposed development.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

Paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) promotes a 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. For decision takers this means

(c) approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or (d) where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are more important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission, unless: i) the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or ii) Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

Paragraph 8 of the NPPF identifies three dimensions to sustainable development as being economic, social and environmental.

In accordance with Policies SS1 and SS2 of the Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan the Council expects all new development to make a positive contribution towards the sustainability of communities and to protect and where possible enhancing the environment. A concentrated focus on future growth is to be directed to larger settlements, including Leek. When considering development proposals the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

In compliance with Policy SS5, new development should be directed to the most sustainable locations. The site lies within the market town of Leek, which is one of the main urban areas where the focus of new development will be directed, with the aim of crafting all development to enhance the character and appearance of the town.

The proposed site is within the Development Boundary, thus the proposed extension is acceptable in principle, subject to conformity with other relevant national and local planning policies. The main issues which need to be considered as part of the assessment of the proposed extension include design, neighbour amenity and highway safety.

Design

Policy DC1 seeks to ensure that all development is well designed and of a high quality, contributing to local distinctiveness and harmonising with sense of place. The Council's Design SPD outlines the Council's expectations in respect of design and states that extensions should harmonise with the parent building. An extension should respect the dominance of the original building and be subordinate to it in terms of its size and massing.

The proposed development is a single storey front extension to the dwellinghouse, forming a porch as well as an extension to the kitchen and study. The proposed extension would project forward of the principal elevation of the original dwellinghouse by 1.5 metres and have a width of approximately 8.06 metres. The maximum height would be approximately 3.46 metres and the maximum eaves height would be 2.12 metres. For a development to be considered appropriate in terms of its size and massing, the Council would universally expect to see extensions subordinate to the dominance of the original building. Thus, as the

proposed extension would be single storey and therefore have an eaves and maximum height lower than the parent building, as well as follow the course of the original dwellinghouse, it would be considered appropriate development in accordance with the Council's Design SPD.

Materials used in the construction of the proposed extension would not match those used in the construction of the existing dwelling, as well as from surrounding dwellings in the area. Off-white render, profiled brown textured concrete slates, uPVC flush-fit casement windows in grey and a uPVC composite door in grey would be used in the construction of the proposed extension. Whilst some of the materials would match those used in the construction of the existing dwellinghouse, it cannot be ignored that off-white render would contrast from the existing dwellinghouse, as well as the surrounding street scene. Thus, off-white render would not match the existing materials or harmonise with the surrounding street scene, detracting from the distinctive character of the original estate which has been timelessly retained.

As there is no opportunity in the aesthetic of the street scene for render, I note that a brick finish to the external walls to match the main dwelling would be more appropriate development. This can be conditioned.

The proposal, by virtue of its size, scale and siting maintains the character of the existing dwelling and area. The proposal would therefore accord with the provisions of local plan policy DC1 and section 12 of the NPPF in this regard.

Amenity

Paragraph 127 f) of the NPPF seeks to secure a high standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants. Local Plan Policy DC1 requires development to achieve a satisfactory relationship to adjacent development and to not cause unacceptable effects by reason of visual intrusion, overlooking, shadowing, overbearing effect, noise, light pollution or other adverse impacts on local character and amenity.

The application site is bound by No.1 Rownall View to the South-west and No. 5 Rownall View to the North-east. As the proposed extension is a front extension, it would not adversely impact No. 8 and No. 9 School Close, where the rear curtilage of the site adjoins their rear curtilage. Therefore, amenity impact assessment is essential on the direct neighbouring properties to the sides of the application site only.

The positioning of No. 1 Rownall View is slightly forward of the dwellinghouse at the application site. As the proposed extension will run parallel to the brick wall of the dwellinghouse at No. 1 and just slightly project forward of its principal elevation, the 45 degree rule would not be breached in this instance and light amenity would not be adversely impacted. Accordinlgy there woud not impact on the residential amenites of the number 1 Rownall View.

Similarly, although there are windows on the principal elevation of No. 5 Rownall View, the small projection of the proposed extension would mean that the 45 degree

rule will not be breached. Thus, the proposed extension would not act as a catalyst for loss of light nor would it be overbearing on the neighbours at No. 5. Additionally, the degree of slope of the roof of the proposed extension creates opportunity for a lower eaves height, reducing potential impact of the proposed extension in terms of overbearingness.

As the proposed extension would be North-east and the windows at No. 1 Rownall View are South-west, the orientation would not affect the accessible sunlight of the neighbours or cast a shadow over them, especially by the time the sun reaches the West in the evening. The direction of the sunlight trajectory from East to West means that the sunlight of No. 5 Rownall View would not be impacted, as no shadow of the proposed extension would be cast upon them. Therefore, light amenity of the neighbours would not be negatively impacted on.

It cannot be ignored that a substantial amount of foliage creates the boundary treatment between the application site and the direct neighbours at No. 1 and No. 5 Rownall View. A section of wooden panelling incorporating cut out squares sits amongst the foliage between the site and both neighbours, creating another layer of boundary treatment. The collective layering of boundary treatment created via hard and soft landscaping is considered substantial enough to mitigate some of the minimal impact of overbearingness which the proposed extension would cause on the neighbouring properties. Therefore, as the proposed extension will be substantially shielded, and in accordance with Policy DC1.

No windows would be built into any of the side elevations of the proposed extension, instead they will all be located on the front elevation. As a result, privacy of both neighbouring dwellinghouses would not be compromised.

Highway Safety

Paragraph 102 of the NPPF states that patterns of movement, streets, parking and other transport considerations are integral to the design of schemes and contribute to making high quality places. Policy T1 seeks to provide safe and sustainable access and ensure that development does not lead to an increase in on street parking.

The proposed extension would not increase the number of bedrooms of the dwelling. Therefore, it is clear that no additional parking spaces will be required for the number of people habituating the dwellinghouse. As the proposed extension would only project 1.5 metres forward from the principal elevation, sufficient space would remain to the front of the dwelling to maintain the existing and sufficient level of off road parking. This is considered to be important because the proposals involve the loss of the integral garage.

Thus, the proposed extension would have no impact on highway safety, in accordance with Policy T1.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

In consideration of all of the above, the application is recommended for approval. Due to the application having no adverse effect upon neighbour or street scene amenity and no overall impact on the highway, it is deemed acceptable under planning policy. Although the off-white render finish to the proposed extension would not be acceptable, I note that a condition can be imposed in order to secure a more appropriate brick finish. Therefore, the proposed extension is recommended for approval, subject to compliance with this condition.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

Case Officer: Hannah Hollins
Recommendation Date: 07/01/2021

X

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council