

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2021/0815
Valid 15/12/2021

9 WOODSIDE LANE
LEEK

PROPOSED DORMER
EXTENSION.

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Design
- Amenity
- Highway Safety

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The proposed site comprises a corner plot detached brick and tile dwellinghouse and its associated curtilage, situated in the Leek South ward. The site is within the Leek (Ladderedge) Development Boundary, where the Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan seeks to concentrate development. The proposed site is enclosed by neighbouring dwellings comprising a section of Woodside Lane and backs on to open greenbelt countryside to the North-East. No. 7 Woodside Lane lies to the North-West of the proposed site, adjoining with the curtilage of the site. No. 26 and No. 28 Woodside Lane are situated to the South-East, separated from the curtilage of the site by the Woodside Lane highway. The Woodside Lane highway also runs adjacent to the proposed site on the South-West.

It is noted that a number of properties within the area have been extended; however the established character of the original estate has been retained.

PROPOSAL

Initially, the proposed development comprised a two storey extension which would have spanned across a section of the principal elevation. The proposed plans showed that the extension would have formed enlargements to the rooms labelled as reception 1 and reception 2 on the ground floor and bedrooms 2 and 3 on the first storey. The proposed front extension would have projected forward of the principal elevation of the original dwellinghouse by approximately 1.7 metres and have a width of approximately 8.8 metres. The maximum height would have been approximately 6.6 metres and the maximum eaves height would be 4.9 metres. Materials used in the construction of the proposed front extension would have consisted of red / brown facing brickwork and red / brown plain tiling.

Revised plans were then submitted, changing the extension to a dormer extension on the principal elevation roof plane of the dwellinghouse. The proposed dormer extension would replace an existing dormer window on the principal elevation roof

plane. The proposed dormer extension would project from the principal elevation roof plane by approximately 2.25 metres and have a width across the South-East of the principal elevation roof plane of 8.1 metres. It would have a maximum height of approximately 2.9 metres and an eaves height of 1.4 metres. It would be constructed from materials which would be of a similar appearance to those used in the construction of the existing dwellinghouse, such as hung tiles and white uPVC.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan (Adopted 2020)

SS1 Development Principles
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/1986/0605 – Extension to form larger lounge and kitchen / dining room, roof height raised to accommodate bedroom and boxroom. Approved.
SMD/1997/0174 – First floor extension to form lounge over existing garage. Approved.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 09/02/2022
Neighbour consultation period ends: 26/01/2022
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

No public comments were received.

Town / Parish Comments

Leek Town Council believe that the proposed extension is not unneighbourly.

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 extension is 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 extension 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.

Initially, the proposed development comprised of a two storey extension to the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse. The proposed extension would have projected forward of the principal elevation of the original dwellinghouse by approximately 1.7 metres and have had a width of approximately 8.8 metres. The maximum height would have been approximately 6.6 metres and the maximum eaves height would be 4.9 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 extension as initially presented was considered to be unacceptable in terms of its design. The Staffordshire Moorlands Design Guidance SPD states the following:

"An extension should respect the dominance of the original building and be subordinate to it in terms of its size and massing."

Whilst additions to dwellings should be able to be read as extensions, the initially proposed extension would have created a very dominating addition to the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse. It would not have been subordinate to the host dwelling, due to its large size and massing. I note that it would not have been set down from the maximum ridge or eaves heights, again indicating that it would compete with the proportions of the parent dwelling.

The Staffordshire Moorlands Design Guidance SPD states the following:

"The details of a building – its windows, doors, chimneys etc have an importance that belies their size... The eye is instinctively drawn towards them."

"Doors are an important feature, particularly to a front elevation... Main elevations without doors look very unsatisfactory."

"Windows are among the most important features of an elevation."

"The design of replacement or new windows needs to relate to the age and style of the property in question."

The addition of the proposed extension would mean that the front door would no longer be located on the principal elevation, completely altering one of the main focal points of ornamentation on the principal elevation. Without the focal point of the front door on the principal elevation, the visual aesthetic of the house would become less pleasing. Furthermore, the addition of the proposed extension would mean that the existing bay window features would be removed from the principal elevation of the dwelling and replaced with windows which would run flush with the new principal elevation. This would mean that another main, important feature of ornamentation on the original principal elevation would be lost as a result of the proposed extension. The Council believe that the addition of the initially proposed extension would mean that the character of the dwelling would be lost. It would be a very dominating

addition to the principal elevation of the dwelling and would not be read as an extension or subordinate to the host dwelling.

Materials used in the construction of the initially proposed extension would have matched 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. Red / brown facing brickwork and red / brown plain tiling would be used in the construction of the proposed extension.

Revised plans have since been submitted, altering the proposed large extension to the principal elevation of the dwelling to a dormer extension to the roof plane of the principal elevation. This would replace an existing dormer window on the principal elevation roof plane. The proposed dormer extension would project from the principal elevation roof plane by approximately 2.25 metres and have a width across the South-East of the principal elevation roof plane of 8.1 metres. It would have a maximum height of approximately 2.9 metres and an eaves height of 1.4 metres.

The newly proposed dormer extension would clearly have a subordinate relationship with the parent dwelling, not being of a dominant size and massing. It would be set down from the maximum ridge height of the existing dwellinghouse and would only span across approximately half of the roof on the principal elevation. Therefore, the proposed dormer extension would not compete with the proportions with the host dwellinghouse. The addition of a dormer extension as opposed to a full extension across half of the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse would result in preserving the important focal points of a desirable principal elevation, such as the front door and bay windows. Retaining these important features would mean that the dwelling would keep its character and therefore, be considered appropriate development in accordance with Policy DC1.

The materials set to be used in the construction of the dormer extension would be hung tiles and white uPVC, to match those used in the construction of the existing dwellinghouse. Although hung tiles are not specified on the revised plan submitted, it shall be conditioned that they are used. Therefore, the materials which would be used 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 distinctive character of the original estate which has been largely retained.

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 the curtilage of No. 7 Woodside Lane to the North-West. As the site is a corner plot, the South-East side elevation of the dwelling faces the principal elevations of No. 26 and No. 28 Woodside Lane, separated from each other by the Woodside Lane highway. As the proposed extension is a front extension and the rear curtilage of the dwelling adjoins open greenbelt countryside to the North and East, no amenity impact assessment is required here. Therefore, amenity impact assessment is only essential on the direct neighbouring properties of the application site.

I note that whilst the proposed dormer extension would be positioned on the South-East of the principal elevation roof plane, the neighbours at No. 7 Woodside Lane are positioned to the North-West of the site. Therefore, as the dormer extension would be positioned on the opposite side of the roof to this neighbour, it would not adversely impact their light amenity in any way. Any potential light loss which could occur for No. 7 Woodside Lane as a result of the extension would therefore be substantially mitigated by the distance between them. Thus, No. 7 Woodside Lane would not be adversely impacted by the proposed extension. As the sunlight trajectory travels from East to West, the proposed dormer extension could potentially cause overshadowing upon this neighbour. However, due to the smaller size of the dormer extension and the distance between the extension and the neighbour, overshadowing would not be caused.

Upon assessment of the potential amenity detriment which the proposed dormer extension could bring forth on No. 26 and No. 28 Woodside Lane, it has been established that the proposed front extension would not create loss of light amenity into the garden or any windows of the neighbour. Although the site is on a higher ground level to these neighbours, the proposed dormer extension would be of a small enough size to mean that no shadowing would be created over them. Furthermore, shadowing as a result of the proposed dormer extension caused by the East to West sunlight trajectory would not have an impact on light amenity of these neighbours. The substantial distance as well as the oblique angles of the positioning of the site and the neighbours at No. 26 and No. 28 Woodside Lane are contributing factors which indicate that their amenity would not be adversely impacted. Thus no amenity impact will occur here.

There would be no side windows on the side elevations of the proposed dormer extension which face the neighbours at No. 7 or No. 26 and No. 28 Woodside Lane, thus there would be no privacy impact. Therefore privacy amenity of all neighbours would not be impacted in this sense. There are already two windows on the existing dormer on the principal elevation of the dwelling which face the neighbour at No. 24 Woodside Lane (opposite the site), therefore the replacement of them with two new windows would not make a difference to their privacy. Thus, no adverse privacy impact would occur upon any 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 dormer 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 a dormer extension, 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. Initially, the proposed two storey front extension would not have been acceptable in terms of its design. Its' dominant massing, as well as the reconfiguration of the front door and removal of the important bay window features on the existing principal elevation would have negatively impacted the principal elevation of the dwelling. The revised plans submitted, comprising of a dormer extension on the principal elevation roof plane are more appropriate in terms of design. The proposed dormer extension would clearly have a subordinate relationship with the host dwelling and the important features of ornamentation on the principal elevation would be retained. Therefore, the proposed extension is recommended for approval, subject to compliance with all conditions.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

Case Officer: Hannah Hollins

Recommendation Date: 09/02/2022

X 

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council