

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2021/0615
Valid 23/09/2021

HIGH VIEW HARTINGTON
STREET
LEEK

CONSTRUCTION OF A FRONT
PORCH, SIDE EXTENSION
AND DORMER ROOF
EXTENSION.

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Design
- Amenity
- Highway Safety

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The proposed site comprises a semi-detached brick and tile dwellinghouse and its associated curtilage, situated in the Leek South 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 Hartington Street, which has a traditional, arts and crafts style street scene. No. 10 Hartington Street lies to the North of the proposed site and Kismet, Hartington Street is situated to the South. The Hartington Street highway runs adjacent to the proposed site on the East.

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 would consist of a porch extension on the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse, a side extension on the Northern side elevation of the original dwellinghouse and a rear dormer extension. The side extension would allow for a larger W/C and utility room and the rear dormer extension would accommodate for an additional bedroom and ensuite, as well as eaves storage.

The proposed porch extension would have a length of 2.23 metres across the Eastern principal elevation of the dwelling and a width of approximately 3.92 metres. The total maximum height of the single storey porch element of the extension would be approximately 3.54 metres and the maximum eaves height is approximately 2.41 metres. The single storey side extension would have a length across the Northern side elevation of the dwelling of 3.98 metres and a width of 1.04 metres. The maximum height of the single storey side extension is approximately 3.54 metres (from the highest ground level) and the maximum eaves height would be 3.04

metres. The rear dormer extension projects 2.80 metres beyond the existing rear roof slope and has a width of 5.70 metres. As it is flat roof former, the maximum height is 2.30 metres.

Revised plans have been submitted to address officer concerns about the proposed materials. The plans now show that the materials to be used in the construction of the proposed porch and side extensions will consist of brick, tile and anthracite UPVC to match the existing dwellinghouse. Hung tiles on the face and sides and a zinc roof will be used to construct the dormer extension to the rear of the dwelling, to match the existing dwelling.

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

N/A

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Time extension expiry date: 03/12/2021

Neighbour consultation period ends: 27/10/2021

Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

One public comment of support has been received from the neighbours opposite. They believe that the applicants are making positive investment into the house.

Town / Parish Comments

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

Severn Trent Water

No comments were made.

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.

I note that there is a proposed raised patio area shown to the rear of the dwelling on the plans submitted. When measured to the highest point (next to the patio doors), the raised patio would not exceed 0.3 metres in height, therefore this would be classed as permitted development and does not require planning permission.

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 porch extension on the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse, a side extension on the Northern side elevation of the original dwellinghouse and a rear dormer extension.

The proposed porch extension would extend beyond the original principal elevation and wrap around the Northern side elevation into an outdoor area covered by roofing. The roofing would then adjoin the side extension, positioned further towards the rear of the dwelling. The proposed dormer extension will protrude from the rear roof slope. The proposed porch extension would have a length of 2.23 metres across the Eastern principal elevation and a width of approximately 3.92 metres. The total maximum height of the single storey porch element of the extension would be approximately 3.54 metres and the maximum eaves height is approximately 2.41 metres. The single storey side extension would have a length across the Northern side elevation of the dwelling of 3.98 metres and a width of 1.04 metres. The maximum height of the single storey side extension is approximately 3.54 metres and the maximum eaves height would be 3.04 metres (measured from the highest ground level). The rear dormer extension projects 2.80 metres beyond the existing rear roof slope and has a width of 5.70 metres. As it is a flat roof dormer, the maximum height is 2.30 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.

The proposed porch and side extensions would be single storey, therefore the eaves and maximum heights of these extensions would be set down from the parent building. Thus they would be considered appropriate development in accordance with the Council's Design SPD. I note that although the porch and side extensions would adjoin via a wraparound roof with an area of outdoor space between, the 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 dormer extension to the existing dwellinghouse would be acceptable on design grounds, due to its subordinate nature with the parent dwellinghouse. The rear dormer extension would not compete with proportions of host dwelling, which can be supported by its PD fallback position. As the addition of the rear dormer extension would not exceed the cubic content of the original roof space by more than 50 square metres, it would not be considered too substantial in the sense that it would not create a domineering feature on the host dwelling.

Initially, materials used in the construction of the proposed extensions would not 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 arts and crafts style house types, a prominent feature of the street scene is the brick used in the construction of the dwellinghouses. Initially, natural timber clad and zinc roofing were to be used in the construction of the proposed porch extension, brick and zinc roofing were to be used in the construction of the proposed side extension and zinc cladding was to be used in the construction of the proposed rear dormer extension. Anthracite UPVC is to be used in the construction of the windows / doors. Other than the proposed brickwork to be used for the proposed side extension and the anthracite UPVC, the rest of the proposed materials were not considered appropriate or in character with the host dwellinghouse or the surrounding street scene.

The Staffordshire Moorlands Design Guide SPD states that extensions need to be designed and built in sympathy with the property which they serve, and that materials used in the construction of extensions should generally match those of the parent building. The surrounding street scene is comprised of traditionally built arts and crafts style dwellinghouses. The timber cladding would not be an appropriate material for the construction of the proposed porch extension on the principal elevation, as it would completely differ from the brick used in the construction of the host dwelling. The Staffordshire Moorlands Design Guide SPD states that: *“There is no tradition of external timber boarding in Staffordshire Moorlands.... Vertical boarding has been used more recently on large agricultural sheds as an alternative to metal sheeting but such buildings are regarded as exceptions, as the development is seen in the context of traditional buildings or open landscape.”* Additionally, the Design Guide SPD states that *“new materials need to respect the building and its setting”*. It is felt that as the host dwelling is constructed from brick, timber cladding would visually be out of character. There is no tradition of timber being used in a domestic setting.

I note that zinc cladding would not be an acceptable material to be used in the construction of the proposed rear dormer extension or the porch and side extension roofing for similar reasons. Although the point has been made that a zinc dormer extension could comply with permitted development regulations, the Council do not view this as permitted development because we do not consider that zinc would be of a similar design to the existing roof tiles. The Council believe that zinc would look visually out of character with the surrounding traditionally built dwellinghouses. Class B.2(a) of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) states the following:

***“Development is permitted by Class B subject to the following conditions -
(a) the materials used in any exterior work shall be of a similar appearance to those used in the construction of the exterior of the existing dwellinghouse.***

The visual impacts of the materials used will be the most important consideration. For example:

- the flat roofs of dormer windows will not normally have any visual impact and so, in this case, the use of materials such as felt, lead or zinc for flat roofs of dormers will therefore be acceptable.*

• *the face and sides of a dormer window should be finished using materials that give a similar visual appearance to existing house. So the materials used for facing a dormer should appear to be of similar colour and **design** to the materials used in the main roof of the house when viewed from ground level. Window frames should also be similar to those in the existing house in terms of their colour and overall shape.”*

Although a zinc flat roof for the dormer would be acceptable under permitted development, the use of long zinc panels to create the face and sides of the dormer extension is not considered to be of a similar design to the existing roof tiles. Whilst a zinc dormer extension would be constructed from long, flat panels, hung tiles are overlayed so create a series of ridges, thus creating a more similar visual appearance and design to the existing roof. This can be demonstrated in the photograph below, showing how the hung tiles are more congruous with the overlayed design of the existing roof tiles:



Revised plans have been submitted showing alterations to the proposed materials. The porch extension and single storey side extension will now be constructed from brick and tiles to match the host dwelling. The rear dormer extension will be constructed from hung tiles to match the roof tiles on the existing dwelling, as well as a zinc flat roof. Therefore, the materials are now 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. It shall be conditioned that hung tiles and a zinc roof shall be used to construct the rear dormer extension.

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 130 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. 10 Hartington Street to the North and Kismet, Hartington Street to the South. Assessment of amenity impact will be required on the two direct neighbouring dwellinghouses to the sides of the site.

The proposed single storey side extension would be positioned on the Northern side elevation of the host dwelling, which faces the direct neighbour at No. 10 Hartington Street. I note that No. 10 Hartington Street is on a higher ground than the host dwelling, as well as set on land forward of the host dwelling. Thus, for these reasons combined with the fact that the proposed side extension is only a single storey indicate that the extension would not cause light loss and not adversely impact the amenity of this neighbour. The single storey porch extension would be a substantial enough distance from the neighbour at No. 10 Hartington Street to mitigate any chance of light loss. Additionally, as the porch is a single storey extension, combined with the fact that it would be on a lower topography to the neighbour, means that it would not be considered to be overbearing on the neighbouring dwellings. This is due to its subordinate nature to the host dwellinghouse, as well as the neighbouring dwellinghouses.

Consideration has been given to whether the proposed porch, side and rear dormer extensions might be seen to adversely affect the amenity of the neighbours at Kismet, Hartington Street. As the neighbouring dwellinghouse at Kismet, Hartington Street is positioned to the South of the site, the Northern single storey side extension will be tucked behind the host dwelling on the opposite side to this neighbour, meaning that the neighbour would not be impacted at all. Due to the sunlight trajectory moving from the East to West, the proposed front porch extension could cause slight overshadowing on the neighbours at Kismet, Hartington Street in the morning. However, a substantial enough amount of garden space is located between the porch extension at the host dwelling and the neighbouring dwelling at Kismet, Hartington Street to mitigate loss of light amenity. Thus, there is very little chance of the proposed extension casting a shadow over this neighbour. Furthermore, the distance between the proposed porch extension at the host dwelling and the neighbouring dwelling at Kismet, Hartington Street would alleviate loss of light for them. Lastly, the addition of the rear dormer extension would not adversely impact the amenity of this neighbour, as the sunlight trajectory would mean that no shadow would be cast over them. From this observation, it becomes apparent that the amenity of Kismet, Hartington Street would not be adversely impacted by the proposed extension.

There would be no side windows on either the porch extension or the rear dormer extension which would face the adjoining neighbour Kismet, Hartington Street. Additionally, the proposed side extension would be tucked behind the host dwelling on the opposite side to this neighbour. Therefore, it has been established that the privacy amenity of Kismet, Hartington Street would not be impacted at all.

Although the door into the porch extension would be incorporated into the side elevation of the extension which would face the neighbours at No. 10 Hartington Street, porches are not considered to be a habitable room where people spend quality time. Therefore, it is not felt that the privacy amenity of this neighbour would be affected by this. I note that the neighbouring dwelling at No. 10 Hartington Street is on a higher ground level to the site, thus providing further evidence that their privacy amenity would not be affected. Additionally, the boundary wall and foliage separating the two dwellings would aid in mitigating loss of privacy for this neighbour. Although there would be two windows on the side elevation of the proposed side extension for the utility room and W/C, it will be conditioned that they are obscure glazed, to protect the amenity of the neighbour at No. 10 Hartington Street. There will be no side windows on the proposed rear dormer extension, reiterating that the privacy amenity of No. 10 Hartington Street will not be detrimentally impacted. Although there will be a larger amount of fenestration on the rear facing elevation of the rear dormer extension, the host dwelling is on land set back from the neighbouring dwelling at No. 10 Hartington Street, meaning that overlooking will not be an issue. Thus, no adverse privacy impact would occur upon either of the neighbours.

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 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. 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. Although the initially proposed materials were not considered appropriate or in character with the existing dwellinghouse and street scene, the revised plans demonstrate that the new proposed materials will match those used in the construction of the host dwellinghouse. Therefore, the proposed extension is recommended for approval, subject to compliance with all conditions.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

Case Officer: Hannah Hollins

Recommendation Date: 03/12/2021

X 

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council