DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2020/0325 **Valid 31/07/2020**	**ROWAN LODGE TOMPKIN ROAD STANLEY**	**PROPOSED LOFT CONVERSION WITH DORMER TO FRONT & REAR ELEVATIONS** **(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)**

MAIN ISSUES

- Impact to the Conservation area
- Design and visual impact
- Neighbouring amenity
- Highway safety

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site comprises a detached, modern house set back from the main road, Tompkin Road. The dwelling sits on a large plot with ample parking for at least 3 car on site. The frontage is bordered by mature hedges screens the house from the main road to a large extent. The dwellinghouse is rendered off-white and has a tiled gable roof with chimneys. A double garage is attached to the front elevation, with its side elevation facing the front elevation of the dwellinghouse.

Stanley itself is characterised by dwellings of diverse ages and design, set back in large plots, often with vegetation screening to the front.

The dwellinghouse is located in Stanley Conservation Area.

PROPOSAL

The applicant seeks planning permission for a gable dormer window to the front and two dormer windows to the rear, with a large amount of glazing in each dormer extension. This is to create a third floor to the dwelling by means of a loft conversion, to create a large bedroom and en-suite.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan 2020

SS1 Development Principles
SS2 Settlement Hierarchy
SS9 Smaller Villages Area Strategy
DC1 Design Considerations
DC2 The Historic Environment
T1 Development and Sustainable Transport

National Planning Policy Framework

Paragraph 127
Section 9

SITE HISTORY

SMD/1980/0442	Site for dwelling	Approved 24/10/80.
SMD/1981/0036	Details of dwelling	Approved 22/05/81.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 25/09/20
Neighbour consultation period ends: 24/08/20
Press Advert: 12/08/21

Public Comments

Neighbours	No representation received
Endon with Stanley Parish Council	No objections
County Highways	No comments received
Staffordshire County Council Highways	None
Severn Trent	No objection subject to informatives
Conservation Officer	Dormer windows are not a feature of the local vernacular and their addition to the front and rear of this building would be particularly harmful because of its commanding presence.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of development
Stanley is defined in the Local Plan as a Smaller Village. Local Plan Policy SS9, the Smaller Villages Area Strategy, allows limited new development in these locations, provided that it reflects and enhances each village's special character and heritage by protecting and enhancing the setting and historic character of the village, including heritage assets.

The proposal involves a loft conversion which may be defined as limited development. The principle of development is therefore appropriate subject to its impact on the setting and historic character of the village.

As there are no 'in principle' objections to the application the material planning considerations are therefore those including impact to the conservation area, design, visual impact, neighbour amenity, whether there are any parking implications and drainage.

The proposal is in accordance with Policy SS9 of the Local Plan.

Heritage and design consideration
Section 16 of the NPPF sets out the government's advice on conserving and enhancing the historic environment. Paragraph 194 states that any harm, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset…should require clear and convincing justification. Paragraph 196 states that where a development proposal which will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

Policy DC1 refers to design and states that all new development should be of a high quality and add value to the local area, incorporating creativity, detailing and materials appropriate to the character of the area. New development should promote a positive sense of place and identity through its scale, height, density, layout, siting, landscaping, character and appearance.

Policy DC2 states that development affecting the significance of a designated or non-designated heritage asset and its setting will be expected to preserve or enhance its significance.

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 council has also published a series of design guidance notes to help applicants and owners of historic buildings. The notable guidance is the repairs and alterations to historic buildings.

The application site is located in Stanley Conservation Area. The Conservation officer has commented on the application and note that whilst the property is relatively modern, built in 1981, it is integrated reasonably well in its context. However, the proposed materials and height of the dormer windows are not a feature of the local vernacular and by itself, the proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the Conservation Area as a result of the conspicuous height of the dormers. It was suggested that rooflights would be an alternative to reducing there prominence.

The Council has made several efforts to bring this application to a more favourable outcome subject to alterations suggested by the Conservation officer. The

applicant's agent, whom was appointed late in the planning process, has confirmed that they wish for the Council to consider the original scheme.

The Case officer has also relayed that rear dormer windows are not permitted under the General Permitted Development Order.

In view of the above, the case officer recognises that the dwellinghouse in question is not itself of historic value, having been built in 1981 and is in agreeance with the Conservation officer that it is well integrated with the overall typology of the village owing to its long sloped roof and gable features. There was one dwelling within the street scene that featured a dormer window. However, the dormer sits lower in the roof and relates well with the character of this building. Nevertheless, each application is to be considered on its own merits.

When considering the character and appearance of the front dormer window, this sits high within the roof slope of the dwelling and appears cumbersomely above the narrow linear window below. The incongruous position of the dormer is made obvious by its over glazing and disproportionate width to the narrower windows below that overall creates a top-heavy appearance For context, the width of the proposed front dormer is approx. 2.8m whereas the largest window on the first floor has a width is 1.15m. Overall, the dormer does not provide a semblance of balance to the dwellinghouse and as such, would have an adverse impact within the street-scene.

In terms of the rear dormer windows, these will not be visible from the street scene as they sit to the rear and screened by the bordered mature hedging and trees. Similar to the front dormer, the rear dormers are larger than the windows on the first floor and does not reflect the existing character of the windows which are three-panel glazing. It is recognised that the window would be in line with the windows below and to the rear, the dormers would have an adverse impact on the character of the dwelling and the Conservation area it sits within.

The Conservation officer refers to the proposal as less than substantial harm. Referring to the public benefit of the scheme, it is recognised that the applicant wishes for additional living space in the roof of the dwelling. However this is entirely a private benefit and thus has no public benefit. As such, the proposal is harmful to the Conservation Area contrary to Paragraph 196 in the NPPF.

The application fails to take into account the character of the Conservation Area and therefore, does not accord with National Planning Policy and Policy DC1 and DC2

Amenity

Local Plan Policy DC1 and paragraph 127f) of the National Planning Policy Framework seek to secure development that protects the amenity, including residential amenity, in terms of satisfactory daylight, sunlight, outlook, privacy and soft landscaping.

The main neighbouring property that this proposal would impact upon are the neighbouring property Stanley Cottage to the western side of the application site and Stone Cottage to the eastern side of the application site.

It is considered that the neighbour's amenity located to the western side of the property will be maintained as the front dormer will face onto the main road and the neighbour's driveway as the neighbour's property sits back from the front elevation of the dwellinghouse and there is a sufficient separation distance of 8m to not cause any undue overlooking. To the rear, the neighbour's rear elevation is set back 10m from the rear elevation of the application site and as such, the two rear dormer windows would directly look out onto open fields.

When considering the neighbour to the east of the site, the neighbour's amenity will be maintained as direct views from their principal elevation will be of the applicant's front gable projection due to the 90 degree orientation of the property. In addition, there is a sufficient separation distance of 21m from the application site.

It is for these reasons that the proposed development will comply with policy DC1 of the Local Plan (2020) and the NPPF (2019).

Highway Safety

Policy DC1 and T1 seek to achieve parking and access appropriate to the development it serves.

The proposal involves the creation of one new bedroom. The dwellinghouse will as a result of the development have five bedrooms. According to Council Parking Guidance, as the dwellinghouse already had four bedrooms, no extra spaces are required and it is only necessary to demonstrate retention of three parking spaces within the curtilage of the dwelling.

As the dwelling has and will retain the garage and has ample parking space to the front, this is achieved and no highways issues are raised by the proposal. It is in accordance with Policies DC1 and T1.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

By virtue of its scale, siting and appearance, the proposal will have an adverse impact upon the street-scene and the main dwelling itself. It is considered that the proposal is disproportionate to the existing dwelling that fails to consider the character of the dwelling and setting of the Conservation area. The harm to the Conservation area, whilst less than substantial would not be outweighed by public benefits. The benefits in this case are entirely private.

This application will not accord with the relevant policies contained in the Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework. As such a recommendation of refusal is provided.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : Refusal

Case Officer: Lisa Li
Recommendation Date: 24/06/21

X 

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council