

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2021/0527
Valid 10/08/2021

8 MULBERRY WAY
LEEK

**DEMOLITION OF
CONSERVATORY AND
ERECTION OF SINGLE
STOREY / TWO STOREY
EXTENSION**

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Design
- Amenity
- Highway Safety

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The proposed site comprises a detached brick and tile dwellinghouse and its associated curtilage, situated in the Leek East 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 Mulberry Way. No. 6 Mulberry Way lies to the West of the proposed site and No. 10 Mulberry Way is situated to the South. The Mulberry Way highway runs adjacent to the Eastern curtilage of the site, separating the site from No. 38 Mulberry Way. Additionally, the Mulberry Way highway also runs adjacent to the proposed site on the North.

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 two storey side extension on the East side elevation with a single storey rear extension positioned behind the extension and rear elevation, replacing an existing conservatory. The proposed extension would allow for a larger open plan dining room and lounge area on the ground floor to the rear of the dwelling and a bedroom extension on the first storey of the East side elevation. The proposed side extension would have a length of 7.19 metres across the Eastern side elevation and beyond the rear elevation of the dwelling and a width of approximately 4.94 metres. The total maximum height of the single storey rear element of the extension would be approximately 3.47 metres and the maximum eaves height is approximately 2.55 metres. The maximum height of the two storey side element of the proposed extension is approximately 6.59 metres and the

maximum eaves height would be 5.02 metres. It would be constructed from materials which would harmonise with the existing dwellinghouse, including facing brickwork, concrete interlocking roof tiles and white uPVC casement style windows.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan (Adopted 2020)

SS1 Development Principles
1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
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

Staffordshire Moorlands Design Guide SPD

Part 5 – Alterations, Extensions and Conversions

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

SMD/1981/0158 – Residential development. Refused.
SMD/1982/0252 – Site for residential development. Refused.
SMD/1991/0200 – Phase 2 Pickwood Avenue Pickwood Leek – Residential development 109 dwellings. Approved.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 05/10/2021
Neighbour consultation period ends: 14/09/2021
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

No public comments were received.

Town / Parish Comments

Leek Town Council have commented that the proposed extension is not unneighbourly.

Severn Trent Water

Severn Trent have commented that the proposal has minimal impact on the public sewerage system and can advise that they have no objections to the proposals and do not require a drainage condition to be applied.

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 enhance 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 works are 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 works 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 consists of a single storey rear extension, wrapping around the Eastern side elevation into a two storey side extension.

The proposed extension would extend beyond the original rear elevation and wrap around the Eastern side elevation. The proposed side extension would have a length of 7.19 metres across the Eastern side elevation and beyond the rear elevation of the dwelling and a width of approximately 4.94 metres. The total maximum height of the single storey rear element of the extension would be approximately 3.47 metres and the maximum eaves height is approximately 2.55 metres. The maximum height of the two storey side element of the proposed extension is approximately 6.59 metres and the maximum eaves height would be 5.02 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.

Although the proposed side extension would add a two storey element to the East side of the dwelling, the proposed extension would reflect the style of the existing building in terms of the roof course to match the roof course of the side of the dwellinghouse. The eaves and maximum height of the proposed side element would be set down from the parent building, as well as follow the course of the original dwellinghouse, thus it would be considered appropriate development in accordance with the Council's Design SPD. The two-storey side extension would be set back from the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse, again reiterating its subordinate nature to the parent dwelling. The other addition of a rear extension to the existing dwellinghouse would be acceptable on design grounds, due to its subordinate nature with the parent dwellinghouse.

Materials used in the construction of the proposed extension would match those used in the construction of the existing dwelling, as well as from surrounding dwellings in the area. Although the surrounding street scene is comprised of a varied selection of house types, a prominent feature of the street scene is the brick used in the construction of the dwellinghouses. Facing brickwork, concrete interlocking roof tiles and white uPVC casement style windows would be used in the construction of the proposed extension. Therefore, the materials are considered appropriate in relation to the existing dwellinghouse, as well as the surrounding street scene. Thus, the proposed materials would match the existing materials and harmonise with the surrounding street scene, not detracting from the character of the original estate.

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. 6 Mulberry Way to the West and No. 10 Mulberry Way to the South. Assessment of amenity impact will be required on the two direct neighbouring dwellinghouses to the side and rear of the site. As there is a two storey side element to the proposed extension, the amenity of the neighbour across the road at No. 38 Mulberry Way should also be assessed.

The proposed single storey rear and two storey side extension would wrap around the Southern rear and Eastern side elevations. As the neighbouring dwellinghouse at No. 6 Mulberry Way is positioned to the West of the site, the two storey Eastern side extension will be tucked behind the host dwelling on the opposite side to the neighbour, meaning that the neighbour would not be impacted at all. The single storey rear element of the extension would be a substantial enough distance from the neighbour at No. 6 Mulberry Way to mitigate any chance of light loss. On the whole, the single storey extension would not be considered to be overbearing on the neighbouring dwellings due to its subordinate nature to the host dwellinghouse, as well as neighbouring dwellinghouses. Due to the sunlight trajectory moving from the East to West, the proposed rear element of the extension could cause slight overshadowing on the neighbours at No. 6 Mulberry Way. I note that an approximately 2 metre high timber fence creates the boundary treatment between the site and No. 6 Mulberry Way. The boundary fence, as well as the distance between the proposed extension and the neighbouring dwelling would eradicate any minor chance of overshadowing which could be caused as a consequence of the erection of the proposed extension.

Consideration has been given to whether the proposed side extension might be seen to adversely affect the amenity of the neighbours at No. 10 Mulberry Way. A substantial amount of garden space is located between the host dwelling and the neighbouring dwelling at No. 10 Mulberry Way. Thus, there is very little chance of the proposed extension casting a shadow over this neighbour. Furthermore, the distance between the proposed extension at the host dwelling and the neighbouring dwelling at No. 10 Mulberry Way would alleviate loss of light for them. An approximately 2 metre high timber fence, as well as areas of foliage create the boundary treatment between the site and No. 10 Mulberry Way, which acts as another barrier to mitigate loss of light and overbearingness. From this observation, it becomes apparent that the amenity of No. 10 Mulberry Way would not be adversely impacted by the proposed extension.

There are no window openings on the neighbours' at No. 38 Mulberry Way side elevation. A solid brick wall comprises the whole side elevation. Therefore, loss of natural sunlight through any windows would not occur as a result of the proposed two storey side extension and light amenity of the neighbour would not be compromised in this sense. Furthermore, the Mulberry Way highway separates the site from the neighbours at No. 38 Mulberry Way, creating a substantial enough

distance to eradicate any kind of overbearingness which the two storey side element of the extension could cause.

Although a small side window would be incorporated into the side elevation of the single storey rear element of the extension which would face the neighbours at No. 6 Mulberry Way, the approximately 2 metre high boundary fence separating the two dwellings would mitigate any loss of privacy for this neighbour. Furthermore, as there is only one window on the side elevation of the neighbouring dwellinghouse at No. 10 Mulberry Way which looks to serve the stairs to the first storey, the fenestration on the rear elevation of the proposed extension would not be considered to look onto any habitable windows of the neighbour. One proposed side window will face the blank gable of the neighbour at No. 38 Mulberry Way, on the ground floor of the proposed side extension. Due to the thick hedging comprising the boundary treatment between the site and the neighbours at No. 38 Mulberry Way (separated from one another by the Mulberry Way highway), the side window on the proposed extension would not bring forth any privacy amenity issues. Thus, no adverse privacy impact would occur upon either of the neighbours.

There are no dwellinghouses with curtilages which directly adjoin the North front curtilages of the site, thus no amenity impact will occur here.

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. Additionally, as the proposed extension would be to the rear and side of the dwelling, the available off road parking to the front of the dwelling would not be compromised, in compliance with Policy T1.

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. The various types of boundary treatments and the substantial distances from the proposed extension at the site would ensure that no neighbouring dwellings are adversely affected. Therefore, the proposed extension is recommended for approval, subject to compliance with all conditions.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

Case Officer: Hannah Hollins

Recommendation Date: 04/10/2021

X 

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council