

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2021/0157
Valid 30/03/2021

6 KNIVEDEN LANE
LEEK

SINGLE STOREY SIDE
EXTENSION AND
CONVERSION OF THE
DETACHED GARAGE TO A
HABITABLE ROOM

(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 Leek and lies in the east part of the town on a fairly modern housing estate of mainly 1950s/1960's semi-detached dwellinghouses. The dwelling faces Kniveden Lane to the north-west and with the attached semi-detached dwellings lying to the north-east side and other dwellings to the south-west side also facing the road. There are further similar dwellings to the rear to the south-east. The land around the site rises gradually towards the north-east.

PROPOSAL

This is a householder planning application for flat-roofed single-storey side extension which would be set back considerably from the main front wall of the house and which would project rearwards up to an existing side/rear flat-roofed detached garage adjacent to the side boundary. This would be converted and slightly widened to accommodate a garden room with the same flat roof of equal height as current but with a roof lantern structure on top to let in light. A set of side bi-fold doors would face the garden. It would be internally linked to the house via the proposed side extension which along with a passage would also accommodate a utility area and shower room.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Staffs Moorlands Local Plan (adopted September 2020)

DC1 – Design Considerations

NPPF (Revised February 2019)

Sections 12 (Design).

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

None relevant.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 27.5.21

Neighbour consultation period ends: 27.5.21

Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

Letters of objection have been received regarding the impact of the works on the adjacent neighbouring property to the south-west. The points raised are as follows:

- Flat roofs are against the design principles of the Council and there are no flat-roofed extensions of that size in the area.
- Due to the difference on ground levels, the side wall of the extension will appear excessively high and will cause overshadowing and growth of moss in the Winter months
- Due to the ground levels, the side extension would appear overbearing from the road
- Due the ground levels, the side extension would appear overbearing when leaving both entrance doors of the neighbours house which are on the side elevation facing the proposed extension, particularly as the rear-most door is the door used to access the garden from the kitchen.
- The widening of the dropped kerb and driveway will deprive local residents of a parking space on the road and there is parking congestion on the road.

A letter of support has been received from a local resident of Lowther Place who considers the proposal will not cause any overlooking and the driveway works would help with parking congestion.

Town / Parish Comments

Not unneighbourly but there are concerns with the height of the wall.

Local Highways Authority

No objection.

Severn Trent Water

No objection.

OFFICER COMMENTS

The principle of extending dwellings within the development boundaries of towns and villages in the District is acceptable.

With regard to the design and its impact on the character and appearance of the area, whilst the Council's Design Guide resists flat-roof extensions, the presence of flat roof garages is common in the area and a part of the original design of the 1950s/1960s housing development, albeit the garages are set back behind the houses. The flat-roofed side extension would be single storey and would be well proportioned in relation to the form and scale of the main part of the house and would appear very subservient to it. The modern flat-roofed approach would not detract harmfully from the fairly modern 1950s/1960s appearance of the house and matches the appearance of the garages which are original features of the housing estate. It would be less than half the width of the original house and the considerable set back from the front wall of the house would lead it to avoid being harmfully prominent when viewed from the road.

The side wall would appear higher than a standard single-storey extension side wall as the ground levels are slightly higher than the property to the south-west and would appear to be next to an existing retaining side wall. However this retaining wall is less than 1.0 metre in height and it would appear it would be slightly offset from the retaining wall and due to it being a side wall and considerably set back towards the rear part of the house, the side wall would not appear harmfully prominent from the road.

The side extension, due to its height and dimensions, could be built without planning permission if the proposed rear wall did not project any further back than the rear wall of the house. It would be deemed to be "permitted development" under Part 1 Class A of the GPDO and if such a structure was built under permitted development, it would look no different from the road than the side extension applied for.

The side extension would also screen the flat-roof garage to be converted. The side extension to the garage would not be visible from the road. The proposed roof-lantern on top of the garage roof would be visible from the road but due to its, scale, design and siting would not be harmfully intrusive when viewed from the road.

With regard to residential amenity, the points raised by the objectors have been noted. However, the two entrance doors on the side of the objectors property, facing the proposed side wall of the extension are not primary windows and the proposed extension is considered to not lead to an overall harmful loss of light to the dwelling and neither would the proposed side wall appear overbearing as despite the ground levels, it would still appear as a single-storey structure and not two-storeys and the use of the doors to access the garden or driveway would only be brief in any case. All new windows in the extension and garage would be at ground floor level and would not cause a harmful level of overlooking leading to a loss of privacy. With regard to the other points raised in the letters, the creation of moss due to overshadowing from the extension is not a planning matter but more of a civil or maintenance matter and does not relate to residential amenity or overall living conditions.

With regard to the points raised regarding parking problems, the dropped kerb and driveway widening can be undertaken without planning permission as the road is not a classified (or "main") road and in any case, the local highways authority (Staffs County Council) raise no objection to those works. There are no parking restrictions in the road, most houses off the road have off-road parking (driveways and garages) and the increased parking area for No.6 would alleviate the need for occupants to park a third vehicle on the road therefore alleviating parking congestion. Only two parking spaces are required for 3-bed properties in accordance with the Council's parking standards and despite the loss of the garage, the scheme would result in three outdoor off-road spaces for No.6, in excess of the standards.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The proposal would not harm the visual and residential amenities of the area and would therefore comply with the Local Plan and the government planning guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : APPROVE

Case Officer: Chris Johnston
Recommendation Date: 28.5.21

X *B.J. Haywood*

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council