

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2022/0037
Valid 26/01/2022

1 THE GREEN
CAVERSWALL

ONE STOREY REAR
EXTENSION

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Design
- Amenity
- Highway Safety

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The proposed site comprises a terraced pebble style render and tile dwellinghouse and its associated curtilage, situated in the Caverswall ward. The dwelling has previously been extended to the rear under permitted development, in the form of a small single storey lean to extension. No. 2 The Green is situated to the North-East of the site. The rear curtilage of the site adjoins the curtilage of Parkfield, The Green to the South-East. To the South-West of the site is the Auctioneers Arms public house. The highway of The Green runs adjacent to the proposed site on the North-West.

PROPOSAL

The proposed development consists of a single storey rear extension. The proposed extension would allow for the provision of a larger kitchen and living room space to the rear of the dwelling. Initially, the extension was proposed to have a maximum height of 3.2 metres and maximum eaves height of 2.5 metres measured externally from natural ground level. It had a depth of approximately 3.98 metres. It would have a width of 7.34 metres where it joins onto the existing rear extension and 2.78 metres at the opposite end.

A number of revised plans were submitted throughout the application process. The final plans consist of an extension with a maximum height of 3.12 metres and an eaves height of approximately 2.43 metres. The depth of the proposed extension will be 1.72 metres and the width (where it joins onto the existing extension) would be 6.45 metres. The extension would follow the exact course of the boundary, slanting inwards as it progresses outwards.

Materials used in the construction of the proposed extension would match those used in the construction of the existing dwellinghouse, including pebble type render, dark roof tiles and brown 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

HNT/2021/0015 – Single storey rear extension measuring 5.4 metres beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling, maximum height 4 metres and height to eaves 3 metres. Refused.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 22/04/2022
Neighbour consultation period ends: 24/02/2022
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

No public comments have been received.

Town / Parish Comments

Caverswall Parish Council have no objection to the proposed extension subject to the neighbours' approval.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

Paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) promotes a 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. For decision makers 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 Caverswall, 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 Caverswall, 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 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.

The proposed development comprises a single storey rear extension, spanning across the majority of the existing rear elevation of the dwellinghouse. The proposed extension would allow for a larger kitchen / living room area on the ground floor. Initially, the design was a simple flat roof extension. It was proposed that the existing lean to extension would be changed to have a flat roof to match the proposed extension. The extension would have had a maximum height of 3.2 metres and maximum eaves height of 2.5 metres measured externally from natural ground level. It would have had a depth of approximately 3.98 metres. It would have had a width of 7.34 metres where it joins onto the existing rear extension and 2.78 metres at the opposite end.

For a development to be considered appropriate in terms of its size and massing, the Council would expect to see extensions subordinate to the dominance of the original building. As the proposed extension is only a single storey, it would naturally have a subordinate relationship with the host dwellinghouse. The extension would be set back from the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse, demonstrating its subordinate nature to the parent dwelling. The eaves and maximum height of the proposed extension would be set down from the parent building, thus reiterating that it would be considered appropriate development in accordance with the Council's Design SPD.

Whilst the proposed extension was considered to be subordinate to the host dwelling, the design of the extension was considered to be contrived. Although the extension was designed to ensure that the 45 degree rule would not be breached, the result of this was a deliberately designed extension which did not look like a natural addition to the dwellinghouse. Flat roof extensions are generally discouraged in the adopted Staffordshire Moorlands Design guide. As it is an end of terrace dwelling, it is more visible, therefore the Council would be looking to see a roof with a more sympathetic style to compliment the roof of the existing dwellinghouse. The shape of the proposed extension combined with the flat roof would be a contrived design. Thus, the proposed extension would not be sympathetic to or harmonise with the parent building in its design. The patio doors being wrapped around two elevations has an awkward visual aesthetic. On the whole, the addition of the proposed extension would detract from the character of the parent dwelling. The design was considered to be contrived and the Council would not support the flat roof or patio doors wrapping around two elevations. Thus, the addition of the proposed extension to the existing dwellinghouse would not have been acceptable on design grounds.

Revised plans have since been submitted, reducing the proposed extension to a more suitable size. The new proposed extension would have a maximum height of 3.12 metres and an eaves height of approximately 2.43 metres. The depth of the proposed extension will be 1.72 metres and the width (where it joins onto the existing extension) would be 6.45 metres. Although the proposed extension is deliberately designed to ensure that the 45 degree rule is not breached, it joins onto the existing extension in a more natural way, having a more harmonic relationship with the host dwelling. The flat roof has been changed to a lean to roof to match that of the existing extension, creating a more simultaneous relationship between the existing and proposed extensions with the host dwelling. Rather than wrapping around two different elevations, the patio doors will run flush along one singular elevation of the

proposed extension, again improving the aesthetic. Therefore, the new proposed extension is considered to be of an appropriate design, complementing the host dwellinghouse and the surrounding dwellings.

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. Pebble type render, dark roof tiles and brown uPVC windows and doors 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 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. 2 The Green to the North-East. As the proposed extension is a rear extension and the curtilage of the site runs adjacent to the curtilage of Parkfield, The Green to the South-East, it becomes important to assess whether the amenity of this neighbour would be compromised too. Therefore, amenity impact assessment is essential on the direct neighbouring properties to the side and the rear of the application site.

Due to the distance and oblique angle of Parkfield, from the proposed site, the proposed extension would not adversely affect the amenity of this neighbour. Additionally, a substantial amount of boundary treatment in the form of fencing as well as foliage is positioned in front of where extension would be positioned. Therefore, the proposed rear extension would be screened and their light amenity would not be adversely affected. Although there would be a substantial amount of fenestration in the form of windows and doors on the rear elevation of the extension which faces Parkfield, there are already windows and doors on the rear elevation of the existing extension. Additionally, the fenestration would be screened by the boundary treatment between the neighbouring dwellings, ensuring that the privacy of Parkfield, would not be compromised.

Upon assessment of the potential amenity detriment which the proposed extension could bring forth on No. 2 The Green, it has been established that the proposed extension would not create loss of light amenity into the rear windows of the neighbour. As the room solely relies on these areas of fenestration for its light

source, it is viewed that the proposed extension could have a detrimental impact on light into the rear room of the neighbouring dwellinghouse. As the sunlight trajectory travels from East to West, the proposed extension could potentially cause overshadowing upon the garden and rear windows of the direct neighbour at No. 2 The Green. Furthermore, an examination of the submitted site plan shows that the extension would not breach the 45 degree line from the window and door in the rear elevation. I note that careful consideration into the shape of the proposed extension has been made, in order to ensure that the 45 degree rule would not be breached. The proposed extension would progressively be stepped away from the common boundary, meaning that it will not be overbearing over the neighbours habitable window and rear garden. A 1.8 metre high boundary fence creates the common boundary between the proposed rear extension and the rear window at the neighbouring dwelling, acting as a further barrier to mitigate loss of light amenity for the neighbour.

There would be no side windows on the elevation of the proposed rear extension facing No. 2 The Green, therefore privacy amenity of the neighbours would not be impacted at all in this sense. It has also been noted that an approximately 1.8 metre high fence is situated between the site and No. 2 The Green, which would block out any adverse privacy impact regardless. Thus, no adverse privacy impact would occur upon the neighbour at No. 2 The Green.

As the site is an end of terrace dwellinghouse, there are no neighbouring dwellings directly to the South-west of the site and therefore there will be no amenity impact.

Highway Safety

Paragraph 104 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 of the dwelling, on-street 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. Although the design of the initial plans submitted was not considered to be appropriate due to its contrived feel, flat roof and the positioning of the patio doors, alterations have been made to ensure that the extension would be of an appropriate design. Therefore, the proposed extension is recommended for approval, subject to compliance with all conditions.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

Case Officer: Hannah Hollins

Recommendation Date: 21/04/2022

X *B.S. Haywood*

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council