

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2021/0686
Valid 25/10/2021

37 TITTESWORTH ESTATE
BLACKSHAW MOOR
LEEK

DEMOLITION OF EXISTING
FLAT ROOF GARAGE AND
REPLACE WITH NEW
PITCHED ROOF EXTENSION

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Design
- Amenity
- Highway Safety

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The proposed site comprises a corner plot terraced brick, render and tile dwellinghouse and its associated curtilage, situated in the Dane Ward. The site is within the Churnet Valley Masterplan Boundary, where the Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan seeks to concentrate rural regeneration. The proposed site is enclosed by neighbouring dwellings comprising a section of Tittesworth Estate. No. 38 Tittesworth Estate lies to the North of the proposed site and No. 36 Tittesworth Estate is situated to the East. The Tittesworth Estate highway runs adjacent to the proposed site on the South.

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 West side elevation, replacing an existing single storey flat roofed garage. The proposed extension would allow for a larger open plan kitchen and dining room on the ground floor and a bedroom and ensuite bathroom extension on the first storey of the West side elevation. The proposed side extension would have a length of 7.1 metres across the Western side elevation and a width of approximately 2.9 metres. The maximum height of the proposed two storey side extension is approximately 7.8 metres and the maximum eaves height would be 5.5 metres. It would be constructed from materials which would harmonise with the existing dwellinghouse, including brickwork, tiles and white uPVC.

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
SS9 Smaller Villages Area Strategy
SS11 Churnet Valley 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

Site Notice expiry date: 21/01/2021
Neighbour consultation period ends: 14/12/2021
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

No public comments have been received.

Town / Parish Comments

Tittesworth Parish Council have no objections to the proposed development.

Staffordshire County Council Highways

Initially, Highways commented that there would be space to provide the three required off-road parking spaces by the creation of a hardstanding area to the front of the dwellinghouse. However, they requested further details regarding the dropped kerbs and the materials to be used for the hardstanding.

Information has been submitted to demonstrate how a sufficient number of kerbstones have been dropped to accommodate for the driveway. The hardstanding area will eventually be constructed from either block paving or asphalt.

Severn Trent Water

No comments have been received.

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 more limited focus on future growth is to be directed to smaller villages, including Blackshaw Moor, only allowing for development of an appropriate nature. 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 SS9, smaller village settlements should only settle for appropriate development which enhances community vitality or that meets a social or economic need of the settlement and its hinterland. The site lies within the smaller village of Blackshaw Moor, where all new development will have the aim of reflecting and enhancing the special character and heritage of the town.

The proposed site is within the Churnet Valley Masterplan Boundary, where any development should be of a scale and nature and of a high standard of design which conserves and enhances the heritage, landscape and biodiversity of an area. Furthermore, the proposed development would be acceptable, 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 two storey side extension.

The proposed two storey extension would extend beyond the Western side elevation, replacing an existing flat roof single storey garage. The proposed side extension would have a length of 7.1 metres across the Western side elevation and a width of approximately 2.9 metres. The maximum height of the proposed two storey side extension is approximately 7.8 metres and the maximum eaves height would be 5.5 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 West 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. I note that a similar extension was approved under the reference SMD/2009/0611 at No. 35 Tittesworth Estate. However, this extension is set back from the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse, as well as has a lower ridge and eaves height than those of the host dwellinghouse. Therefore, the proportions of the extension do not compete with the proportions of the host dwellinghouse, clearly establishing that the addition is an extension and creating no blurred lines. Initially, plans were submitted demonstrating that the proposed two storey side extension would run flush with the principal elevation of the original dwellinghouse. The maximum and eaves heights of the proposed extension matched the maximum ridge and eaves height of the original dwellinghouse. Thus, this would not accord with the Staffordshire Moorlands Design Guidance SPD, as the development would not be read as an 'extension' or be subordinate in its size and massing to the parent dwellinghouse.

Revised plans were then submitted, setting the two-storey side extension back from the principal elevation and setting it down from the maximum height of the original dwellinghouse, meaning that it would have a more subordinate nature to the parent dwelling. The revised plans demonstrate that the proposed extension would not compete with the proportions of the host dwellinghouse, thus meaning that it would be acceptable in accordance with the Council's Design SPD. It has been noted that the proposed open gable roof pitch of the extension to match the roof pitch of the existing dwellinghouse would be a large visual improvement to the existing flat roof garage to the side of the dwelling. Thus, the proposed works comprise appropriate development which enhances the character of the area.

Initially, the plans showed the addition of patio doors on the side elevation of the proposed extension. Side elevations of dwellings are traditionally known to be quite plain, the main fenestration being on the front and rear elevations. I note that there is

noticeably no boundary treatment around the Western side garden of the dwellinghouse, thus the patio doors would be quite a prominent feature of glazing and not very private or secure from a crime perspective. Revised plans have been submitted, removing the large patio doors from the side elevation and replacing them with a smaller window. Although fenestration is generally encouraged to be positioned on front and rear elevations, a smaller window which matches the design of the windows on the front and rear elevations of the dwelling is not viewed to visually detract from the side elevation of the dwellinghouse. Thus, the plans are now considered to comply with local plan policy DC1.

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. Brickwork, tiles and white uPVC 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. 36 Tittesworth Estate to the East and No. 38 Tittesworth Estate to the North-West. Assessment of amenity impact will be required on the two direct neighbouring dwellinghouses to the side and rear of the site.

The proposed two storey side extension would be positioned on the Western side elevation. As the neighbouring dwellinghouse at No. 36 Tittesworth Estate is positioned to the East of the site, the two storey Western 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 extension would be a substantial enough distance from the neighbour at No. 36 Tittesworth Estate to mitigate any chance of light loss. Due to the sunlight trajectory moving from the East to West, the proposed two storey side extension would not cause any overshadowing on the neighbours at No. 36 Tittesworth Estate. Thus, the distance and positioning 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. 38 Tittesworth Estate. A substantial amount of garden space is located between the host dwelling and the neighbouring dwelling at No. 38 Tittesworth Estate. Thus, there is a reduced 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. 38 Tittesworth Estate would alleviate loss of light for them. As the proposed extension is two storey, there is a chance that it would be overbearing on the neighbours at No. 38 Tittesworth Estate. Two windows are positioned on the side elevation of the neighbour at No. 38 Tittesworth Estate, which would be impacted by the proposed extension in the morning hours. This is due to the East to West sunlight trajectory. I note that both windows are small in size, as well as obscure glazed. Therefore, it becomes clear that neither of these windows are principal windows which serve habitable rooms. As the impact of the proposed extension on natural sunlight entering the side windows of the neighbour would only be in the morning hours, this would not be enough to warrant the refusal of the application. From this observation, it becomes apparent that the amenity of No. 38 Tittesworth Estate would not be adversely impacted by the proposed extension.

Although three small side windows would be incorporated into the side elevation of the proposed extension which would be within closer proximity of the neighbours at No. 38 Tittesworth Estate, there is an oblique angle between the positioning of both dwellinghouses. Therefore, they would not face directly towards this neighbour, meaning that their privacy would not be impacted. Regardless, as the windows on the side elevation of the neighbouring dwellinghouse at No. 38 Tittesworth Estate are obscure glazed and small in size, the fenestration on the side elevation of the proposed extension would not be considered to look onto any habitable windows of the neighbour. There are already a few windows on the first storey of the rear elevation which face towards the neighbours at No. 38 Tittesworth Estate, therefore the addition of one more would impact them no more than they are already impacted. I note that as this window would serve the ensuite bathroom, it would most likely be obscure glazed anyway. As the proposed extension would be on the opposite side of the dwelling to the neighbours at No. 36 Tittesworth Avenue, no new windows would face or overlook them. Thus, no adverse privacy impact would occur upon either of the neighbours.

There are no dwellinghouses with curtilages which directly adjoin the South front curtilage 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 increase the number of bedrooms of the dwelling from three to four. Although this means that an additional parking space should be provided to accommodate for the number of people habituating the dwellinghouse, Staffordshire County Council Highways department have confirmed that there would be the provision for three parking spaces. This is subject to the creation of a hardstanding parking area on the front curtilage of the dwelling, as the plans demonstrate. As the proposed extension would only be positioned on the West 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.

The Highway Authority stated that they consider that an extension to the dropped kerb will be required. However, the applicant has confirmed that he does not intend to alter the kerb and does not consider this necessary as the existing crossing is sufficient. He has provided details of this which have been passed to Highways. No further comments have been received. However, it is noted that any alteration to the access would not require planning permission and would need a license from highways in any event. Therefore the matter can be dealt with under other legislation.

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. Plans were initially submitted with design issues. The extension had not been set back from the principal elevation and set down from the maximum height of the dwelling, meaning that it would compete with the proportions of the host dwelling. Secondly, the large patio doors would have created a large element of fenestration on a traditionally plain side elevation, as well as increased the potential for crime, considering that there is no boundary treatment on the Western curtilage boundary. Revised plans were submitted, setting the extension back from the principal elevation and down from the maximum height of the dwelling. The large patio doors on the side elevation have been replaced with a smaller window, of a more complimentary size comparatively with the existing side elevation windows. Therefore, the proposed extension is recommended for approval, subject to compliance with all conditions.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

Case Officer: Hannah Hollins

Recommendation Date: 21/01/2022

X *B.S. Haywood*

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council