

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2021/0285
Valid 19/04/2021

WHITE GABLES
CLEWLOWS BANK
BAGNALL

PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY
SIDE EXTENSION

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- design
- street scene
- neighbour amenity

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

Detached bungalow with double gable front in varied row of similar; backing on to fields to the east; public footpath along north side; 70m north of Bagnall Conservation Area boundary; recently extended under SMD/2017/0714 part implemented.

PROPOSAL

Single storey side extension with pitched roof hipped to the side and with a ridge height significantly lower than the main roof ridge of the existing dwelling. The extension would infill a space to the side up to the boundary with the neighbouring bungalow, Grafton, to the south.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Local Plan (adopted 9th September 2020)

SS1 Development Principles
SS9 Smaller Villages Area Strategy – Bagnall
SS10 Other Rural Areas Area Strategy
DC1 Design Considerations
DC2 The Historic Environment
DC3 Landscape and Settlement Setting
H1 New Housing Development
NE1 Biodiversity and Geological Resources
NE2 Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows
T1 Development and Sustainable Transport

National Planning Policy Framework February 2019

Paragraph(s) 1 – 14;

Section(s) 4 – Decision making; 11 – Making effective use of land; 12 – Achieving well designed places; 15 – Conserving and enhancing the natural environment; 16 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Adopted Supplementary Planning Documents/Guidance (SPD/G):

- Space About Dwellings SPG
- Design Principles SPG
- Design Guide SPD adopted 21st February 2018

Local Plan Supporting Evidence Documents:

- Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment (2008)

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

82/11393/OLDDC – Extension to form larger lounge and patio – refused
SMD/2017/0714 – Proposed partial demolition - single storey side and rear extension – approved

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 8th June 2021
Neighbour consultation period ends: 30th April 2021
Press Advert: 2nd June 2021

Public Comments

None

Town / Parish Comments

Bagnall Parish Council. Firstly, when the previous application (SMD/2017/0714) was completed, roofing material was used that did not match the existing, contrary to Condition 3 of the planning approval. The current proposal indicates that the roof tile is to match existing, and the Parish Council would ask that it matches the traditional tiled finish on the original part of the house, and which is common in the village, and NOT the inappropriate roof tile design used on the 2017 extension which looks out of place. This was challenged some 2-3 year ago, but no action was taken by the Enforcement Officers.

Should the application be agreed, the Parish Council would like the 2017 extension roof tiles to be replaced with the traditional design also.

Secondly, the 2017 application applied for a change of window colour to grey, whilst the current one is for white windows and door, a clash with the 2017 alterations.

Finally, the Parish Council feels that this addition to the building footprint will be an over development of the site.

Severn Trent Water

Minimal impact on the public sewer system therefore no objection and no requirement for a drainage condition.

Peak and Northern Footpaths Society and the Ramblers Association

Both of these organisations have commented that they raise no objection but that the adjacent footpath 14 (to the north) must remain unaffected by the development.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

In its general approach, in accordance with policy SS1, the Council expects the development and use of land to contribute positively to the social, economic and environmental improvement of the Staffordshire Moorlands. When considering development proposals the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the NPPF. This means that planning applications that accord with the policies in the Local Plan shall be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Development boundary mapping has now been adopted in accordance with the new Local Plan (September 2020). As a 'smaller village' Bagnall does not have a defined development boundary. It is a matter of judgement as to whether specifically in relation to this application the relevant 'area strategy' from the Local Plan is that of SS9 for 'smaller villages' or SS10 covering the 'other rural areas' which comprise (inter alia): "the open countryside surrounding the smaller villages". The question is pivotal as it determines on what basis the principle of housing development here may or may not be supported in planning policy terms. In this case the application site is very much part of a ribbon of development to both sides of the road and which is very much contiguous with the core of the village a short distance to the south - the church is within 180m. The appropriate policy should be considered to be SS9. New housing development is to be limited [SS9 (2) first point] and decided in accordance with H1. Neither policy especially addresses extensions to existing dwellings and the main determining policy is likely to be DC1 – design. The site is outside the Green Belt. The principle of residential development has been established for this site as a result of it being an existing residential plot. PD rights have not been removed (despite the 2017 consent).

Design

The main consideration is the impact on the street scene by closing the gap to the neighbouring bungalow which closely abuts the adjacent boundary; and equally importantly, the impact for neighbour amenity. On the latter point there are two small side windows to the adjacent neighbouring dwelling of Grafton. These are not

'principal' windows and are partially obscured by ripple effect glazing and coloured segments. The proposed extension would come to within c.0.9m of the property boundary (by reference to the proposed ground floor plan at scale 1:100). The neighbouring bungalow side wall appears to closely abut its site boundary separated by a narrow path of perhaps 0.5m width. As non-principal windows of limited service to the adjacent dwelling and despite the narrow separation the proposal would not be restricted in terms of the adopted Space About Dwellings Guidance. No side windows are proposed in the application extension. The proposal does not extend to the rear any further out than the rear wall of Grafton and there would therefore be no Space About Dwellings conflicts for the rear outlook of Grafton.

The proposed extension is not recessed from the front elevation it would adjoin but the design detail involves an existing brick column with adjacent render slightly recessed and the proposal would also have a render finish, again very slightly recessed relative to the brick column. With the roof ridge height for the extension set down some 700mm below the main ridge of the dwelling the overall appearance would be of a subordinate extension in line with adopted design guidance.

In terms of appearance in the street scene there must be some reservation that the development would close the space between White Gables and Grafton and, together with the 2017 extension off the north side, a significantly larger property will result and the Parish Council has raised concern that this amounts to over development.

The point raised by the Parish is understandable but weighing in the balance is the scope for Permitted Development at this property. Under Part 1 Class A to schedule 2 of the GPDO (2015) a side extension is permissible where it is not greater in width than half the width of the original dwelling house. The original dwelling here has a width of 11.3m and this extension would be 4.5m so permissible on this count. However, there are other criteria to be met and one of these is that the extension must not extend forward of a wall which forms the principal elevation of the dwelling house – that facing the road in this case. Whilst the extension does not extend forward of the outermost part of the principal elevation, under some interpretations of the GPDO and taking account of the diagrams in the Technical Guidance (p.15), the inner most part of the principal elevation sets the bar. Based on the canopy over the alcove of the front entrance, in order to be PD, the proposal would need to be set in by 1.4m. How much of an additional difference this might make to the sense of the scale of the development on the street scene is a matter of judgement. On balance it may be considered that the lower roof ridge compared to that of the main dwelling is sufficient and in fact a recess may only serve to create a more awkward front elevation design in this case.

Regarding window frame colour – a point raised by the PC – the applicant has confirmed an intention that the frames shall be of anthracite grey finish to match those of the now existing dwelling.

Regarding roof tiles, in discussion with the LPA the applicant has confirmed an intention to use 'forticrete' gemini double cambered in colour slate grey across the whole property. Although this is a concrete tile and larger than a clay tile, due to having the double camber it will in effect resemble in general appearance the size

and form of a traditional clay tile and the LPA notes that the original tiles were in fact concrete though again they did have resemblance in form and finish to a traditional tile from for the area.

Amenity

With its ample back garden area (>450m²) the plot has sufficient space to meet outdoor amenity policy requirements for occupiers notwithstanding this proposal and the 2017 development. Impact on neighbours (Grafton) has been considered under Design (above) and the PD scope further illustrates that the scheme, despite its proximity to Grafton should be found acceptable on this count.

Highway Safety

The scheme would not alter the parking and turning arrangements which are well provided for at the front of the property.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

In consideration of all of the above the application is recommended for approval.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : approve

Case Officer: Arne Swithenbank

Recommendation Date: 16th June 2021

X 

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council