

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2021/0574
Valid 06/09/2021

4 THE OLD FARMHOUSE
PEARIS DRIVE
ALTON

SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION
(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 Alton and comprises a detached dwelling at the end of a small private cul-de-sac which lies to the north. The site is surrounded by residential development. It is not in a Conservation Area or affected by any other designations or significant constraints.

PROPOSAL

This is a householder planning application for a single-storey flat-roofed porch/boot room structure on the rear elevation (facing north) of the dwelling. Two drawings have been submitted, one showing matching red brick and the other showing the extension finished in a blue-grey brick. A Design and Access Statement has been submitted.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Staffs Moorlands Local Plan (adopted September 2020)

DC1 – Design Considerations

NPPF (Revised July 2021)

Section 12 (Design).

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

None relevant.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 1/11/21.

Neighbour consultation period ends: 1/11/21.
Press Advert: N/A.

Public Comments

None.

Town / Parish Comments

The council object to this application as the councillors believe the extension is out of keeping with the vernacular of the building.

Local Highways Authority

No objection.

OFFICER COMMENTS

The extension would be on the original rear wall of the house. The primary bay-windowed front elevation faces south towards the probable original access to the site off the main road to the south. The access is now via a short private cul-de-sac which serves three other properties and leads to the rear part of the property and the rear elevation is visible from the private cul-de-sac.

The extension has a flat-roofed modern contemporary design which contrasts with and arguable detracts from the Victorian period appearance of the house. The Parish Council objections are noted and are considered to be well founded concerns. However, it would appear very subservient to the house due to its small single-storey scale and height which respects the dominance of the house and based on the drawing showing the extension in red-brick materials, the materials would blend in with the house. The rear elevation of the house is not high quality and is asymmetrical in terms of the windows and back door positioning. It would be visible from the small private cul-de-sac which serves the property although the rear elevation is set back considerably from the north boundary where the access lies. As a result it would not be prominent and cannot be seen from public highways or public footpaths. It would not be prominent from neighbouring properties. Nevertheless the extension would cause harm to the overall character and appearance of the house despite being on the rear elevation, which has less architectural merit than the primary elevation to the other side.

However, if the extension was finished in matching brick it could be built under permitted development without requiring planning permission as it is on the rear elevation and would not project more than 4.0 metres from the original back wall of the house and the height would also not exceed 4.0 metres. This is an important material consideration and in light of this and the other points detailed above, it is not considered that on balance a refusal on design grounds could be sustained, despite the harmful and unsympathetic design of the extension.

The red brick extension would be a better option than the blue-grey brick extension which would lead to a more contrasting and intrusive impact, more discordant with

the appearance of the house. A condition can be imposed to ensure the extension would be built in accordance with the drawing showing the red brick finish.

Due to the distance between the extension and neighbouring dwellings, coupled with its modest size and single storey nature, along with existing boundary treatments it is not considered that any adverse impacts in terms of overlooking or overshadowing would occur.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

Despite the contrasting design, given the PD fallback position and other considerations above on balance it is not considered that a refusal on these grounds could be sustained and due to the distance from the boundaries would not harm residential amenity or interfere with on-site parking provision. The proposal is therefore recommended for approval.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : APPROVE

Case Officer: Chris Johnston

Recommendation Date: 1.11.21

X *B.J. Haywood*

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council