

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2021/0222
Valid 13/04/2021

74 SOUTHBANK STREET
LEEK

SINGLE STOREY REAR LEAN-
TO EXTENSION, 4M HIGH

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Neighbour amenity
- Design
- Heritage – proximity to Leek Conservation Area

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

North-west facing, small rear yard area of attractive traditional brick and tile two storey terraced dwelling in area of consistent similar. Existing single storey flat-roofed rear extension off two storey rear outrigger. Narrow yard and narrow separation to adjacent neighbours. Pedestrian gate into cobbled back lane / alley.

A c.2.1m high brick wall separates the yard from the neighbour at no. 76. This wall is progressively stepped down to the rear as the land falls but maintains its initial height for first c. 3.7m from the main house rear elevation.

PROPOSAL

Demolish single storey flat-roofed element but retain side wall with adjacent neighbour at no. 72. New single storey extension across full house width, not projecting out to full extent of the existing single storey, just part, and also in-filling side yard. Lean-to glazed roof back to main dwelling across the whole.

A revised drawing PL 03E has been received along with an e-mail to confirm points of detail in relation to material finishes.

Insertion of a round window at first floor level in the rear gable outrigger is included in the submitted plans although at this property this is an alteration which would be permitted under GPDO(2015) Schedule 2 Part 1 Class A.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Local Plan (adopted 9th September 2020)

SS1 Development Principles
SS5 Leek Area Strategy
DC1 Design Considerations

DC2 The Historic Environment
H1 New Housing Development
NE1 Biodiversity and Geological Resources
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; 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

None recorded.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 25th June 2021

Neighbour consultation period ends: 17th May 2021

Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

None

Town / Parish Comments

Leek Town Council – no objection subject to not being found un-neighbourly

Severn Trent Water

Minimal impact on the public sewer system therefore no objection and no requirement for a drainage condition. Add advice note that there may be a public sewer though none recorded.

Staffordshire County Council Highways

No objection – no effect on the highway

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

Within the town development boundary therefore acceptable in principle but all other material factors to be considered – in this case in particular, neighbour outlook and

amenity along with design style. Consideration must also be given to heritage as this late 19thC terraced row, and especially nos.74 and 76 retain much original appearance and character including fine stone cills and lintels to windows and doors.

Design

There is a risk that in occupying the full side yard and then projecting beyond the two storey outrigger and spreading to attach across the width of the outrigger as well, the proposal could seem to overwhelm the property. The long shallow slope of the lean-to roof could also seem out of character and certainly the symmetry and rhythm of alternating outrigger and separating yard spaces would be interrupted.

There are however design improvements with the removal of the 2.3m projection of the flat-roofed element. Although a wall would be retained on the side adjacent no. 72 as existing, the new replacement room extension would have a reduced projection of c.1m. Limiting this new replacement projection to 1m can be seen as crucial to the success of the scheme and avoiding it becoming overwhelming to the property. The success of the scheme is also helped by the adoption of a parapet wall to the outer sides. On balance it may be considered that as a design per se the proposal is well adjusted to the building and the longer terrace as a whole and would in fact improve appearances by removing the 'blocky' flat-roofed element.

The LPA has sought confirmation that the retention of very fine large solid stone copings to the dividing boundary wall between no.74 and 76 can be achieved and this has been stated in an email as being possible and indeed the firm intention and also referenced by annotation to the revised drawing. Retention of these original stone copings should be made subject of a condition.

Again in response to LPA inquiry, the material to be used to crown and seal the parapets of the side walls of the new development will be "a metal wrap in anthracite grey or similar to tie in with the modern appearance of the extension". This can be considered an acceptable and appropriate finish avoiding a likely mis-match of materials if a stone or stone style of coping were attempted, given the close proximity of the original stone on the boundary wall.

Also in response to LPA inquiry, the dividing panel seen between the doors and window of the new outward glazing of the extension is confirmed to be a metal insert to match the metal framing.

A further key determining factor and potential compromise is the impact on the adjacent neighbour amenity at no. 76 – considered below.

Amenity

This scheme does not meet Permitted Development criteria and therefore needs planning consent. However a side yard in-fill, if it were not tied to the full width extension across the outrigger, could be constructed as PD subject to not being greater than half the width of the overall original dwelling (half of c.4.6m in this case); not projecting more than 3m; and not exceeding 4m in height. The side element in this scheme is c.1.75m in width, 3.5m in height (at the lean-to point against the main dwelling) and projects in total 4m. Under the householder prior notice option, a scheme may be PD if it exceeds the 3m projection up to a maximum of 6m, subject

to the neighbour being notified and subject to the neighbour not raising objection – which would then need to be assessed by the LPA.

At issue here is the impact of the proposal on the neighbour's ground floor windows – one serving the rear living room in the main two storey part of the dwelling and one in a side wall facing the proposal development and serving a kitchen. In this part of the neighbour dwelling, in addition to the principal window facing the proposed development (NE) there is a door with partial glazing which faces out from the terrace (NW).

The agent has shown in the proposal drawing that the vertical plane 45 degree line for the window in the main dwelling at no. 76 would be just marginally breached by c.20cm by the height at the lean-to point. Implications for the horizontal plane 45 degree line are not shown but it can be seen that the proposal would breach this guide criterion at about 1.3m or at one third of the length of the proposed extension. In this case however it is to be noted that the existing boundary wall between the two properties reaches a height about equal to the mid height of the window and the 45 degree line intercepts the wall at a point where the wall is 2m in height and the proposed extension would be c.3.2m high.

Noting in particular the permitted development which could take place here and also noting the height of the existing dividing boundary wall, the additional impacts of this proposal may be found on balance acceptable.

Heritage

The boundary of the Leek Conservation Area takes in neighbouring 16 Leonard Street and comes to within some 12m north of the application property and includes an attractive and characterful cobbled alley running along the rear of the Leonard Street properties from which there are views to the rear of Southbank Street and the application property. However it is the existing 20thC square-block flat roofed extension which dominates the appearance of the application property in the setting of the Conservation Area [see especially file photo 0062]. The setting back of the proposed replacement combined with retention of the high wall to the boundary with 72 are further factors that can be judged on balance to make the scheme an acceptable design in this heritage setting despite being a wholly modern intervention.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

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

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : **approve**

Case Officer: Arne Swithenbank

Recommendation Date: 2nd July 2021

X *B.S. Haywood*

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council