DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2022/0136 **Valid 14/03/2022**	**32 GENEVA WAY** **BIDDULPH**	**REAR EXTENSION AND LOFT CONVERSION** **(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)**

MAIN ISSUES

- Design
- Amenity
- Highway Safety

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The proposed site comprises a detached brick and tile dwellinghouse and its associated curtilage, situated in the Biddulph North ward. Additionally, the proposed site is within the Biddulph Development Boundary, where positive development is encouraged to be concentrated. The site is enclosed by neighbouring dwellinghouses on the East and West. No. 30 Geneva Way is situated to the West of the site and No. 34 Geneva Way is located to the East. The rear curtilage of the site adjoins a small area of open green space to the South. The Geneva Way highway runs adjacent to the proposed site on the North.

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

PROPOSAL

The proposed development consists of a single storey rear extension and a rear dormer extension. The single storey rear extension will allow for a larger kitchen and dining area on the ground floor and the dormer extension will create the provision for a loft conversion, including a fifth bedroom, dressing room and ensuite. The single storey rear extension would have a maximum height of 3.15 metres and maximum eaves height of 2.10 metres measured externally from natural ground level. It will have a depth of 1.5 metres and a width of 8.34 metres. The proposed rear dormer extension would have a maximum height of 2.27 metres and an eaves height of 1.29 metres. It would have a depth of approximately 3.23 metres and a width of 6.55 metres. Materials used in the construction of the proposed extensions would match those used in the construction of the existing dwellinghouse, including red / brown brick, slate 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
SS6 Biddulph 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/1981/0697 – Proposed vehicular crossings. Approved.
SMD/1987/0764 – Proposed 7 metre wide service roadway from Pennine Way. Approved.
SMD/1987/1266 – Renewal of existing fencing and erection of new fencing. Approved.
SMD/2009/0833 – Erection of up to 200 dwellings, provision of public open space, highway improvements and associated works with environmental statement. Approved.
SMD/2010/0986 – Erection of 200 dwellings, provision of public open space, highway improvements and associated works. Withdrawn.
SMD/2011/0352 – Erection of 198 dwellings with associated garages and parking (reserved matters). Refused.
SMD/2011/1025 – 197 dwellings (Reserved matters). Approved.
SMD/2014/0264 – Application to vary a S106 planning obligation dated 09/02/2010. Approved.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 11/05/2022
Neighbour consultation period ends: 29/04/2022
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

No public comments have been received.

Town / Parish Comments

No comments have been received.

Staffordshire County Council Highways

Staffordshire County Council Highways have no objection to the proposal, as although the proposal creates the provision for a fifth bedroom, the current parking arrangements (drive and garage) can accommodate parking for 3 vehicles. Therefore, parking standards have been met.

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 Biddulph. 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 SS6, new development will be directed to the most sustainable locations. The site lies within the town of Biddulph, 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.

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 single storey rear extension and a rear dormer extension.

The proposed single storey extension would extend beyond the original rear elevation of the dwellinghouse and the proposed dormer extension will protrude from the rear roof slope. The single storey rear extension would have a maximum height of 3.15 metres and maximum eaves height of 2.10 metres measured externally from natural ground level. It will have a depth of 1.5 metres and a width of 8.34 metres. The proposed rear dormer extension would have a maximum height of 2.27 metres and an eaves height of 1.29 metres. It would have a depth of approximately 3.23 metres and a width of 6.55 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 rear extension would be single storey, therefore the eaves and maximum heights of this extension would be set down from the parent building. Thus, it would be considered appropriate development in accordance with the Council's Design SPD. I note that the rear extension would clearly be set back from the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse, again reiterating its subordinate nature to the parent dwelling. It would have a simple mono pitch roof which would be in keeping with the roof course of the host dwelling.

Initially, the proposed rear dormer extension had a maximum height which would match the maximum ridge height of the dwelling. Thus, it was not viewed to be fully subordinate to the parent dwelling, as it would not be set down from the ridge height of the host dwelling. Revised plans have been submitted, showing a reduction in the maximum height of the proposed dormer extension. The maximum height of the dormer extension shall no longer be the same as the maximum ridge height of the host dwellinghouse. Therefore, the addition of a rear dormer extension to the existing dwellinghouse would now be considered 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.

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. Red / brown brick, slate tiles and white UPVC would be used in the construction of the proposed extensions. 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. 30 Geneva Way to the West and No. 34 Geneva Way to the East. Therefore, amenity impact assessment is essential on the direct neighbouring properties to the sides of the application site.

The proposed extensions would be positioned within closer proximity of the neighbouring dwelling at No. 34 Geneva Way, thus amenity impact assessment is paramount. However, it must be noted that all neighbouring dwellinghouses are detached, with plentiful amounts of space between one another, reducing any impact which the proposed extensions would have. Upon assessment of the potential amenity detriment which the proposed extensions could to No. 34 Geneva Way, it has been established that the proposed extensions would not create a detrimental loss of light amenity into the rear principal windows of the neighbour. After a site visit, an examination of the submitted site plan shows that the proposed single storey rear extension would not breach the 45 degree line from the closest rear window belonging to this neighbour. As the proposed extensions would be positioned to the West of the neighbours, the East to West sunlight trajectory would mean that only the slightest amount of light could be lost into the neighbouring garden in the later hours of the day. Furthermore, the approximately 2 metre high boundary fencing and brick outbuilding belonging to the applicants is situated between the proposed rear extension and the neighbour, would aid in reducing the impact on the amenity of the neighbouring property. The neighbouring dwelling at No. 34 Geneva Way is set in a position which means that it would be unaffected by the proposed dormer extension.

Due to the distance of the site from No. 30 Geneva Way, the proposed extensions would not adversely affect the amenity of this neighbour. Additionally, a substantial amount of boundary treatment in the form of fencing as well as a brick garage is positioned in front of where the rear extension would be positioned. Therefore, the proposed rear extension would be screened and the light amenity of this neighbour would not be adversely affected.

There would be no side windows on the elevations of the proposed rear extension and the proposed dormer extension facing both of the neighbours, therefore privacy amenity of the neighbours would not be impacted at all in this sense. Thus, no adverse privacy impact would occur upon the neighbours at No. 30 Geneva Way or No. 34 Geneva Way. Although there would be fenestration in the form of large windows and patio doors on the rear elevation on the single storey rear extension and rear windows in the dormer extension, there are no direct neighbours adjoining the rear curtilage of the dwelling. Additionally, the fenestration would be largely screened by the boundary treatment comprising the rear boundary, meaning that privacy amenity would not be compromised.

The extension s would not be visible to the neighbouring dwellings to the North of the site and therefore there will be no amenity impact.

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. Although this would be the case, Staffordshire County Council Highways have confirmed that the parking standards for a 5 bedroom house have been met at the site (by the driveway and garage). Therefore, the addition of a bedroom would not impact highway safety as an acceptable level of off road parking can be provided. Additionally, as the proposed extensions would be to the rear 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.

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 extensions at the site would ensure that no neighbouring dwellings are adversely affected. Although the proposed dormer extension was initially not considered to be fully subordinate to the host dwelling, its height has been reduced and set down from the ridge height of the host dwelling. Therefore, the proposed extensions are recommended for approval, subject to compliance with all conditions.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

Case Officer: Hannah Hollins
Recommendation Date: 11/05/2022

X

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council