

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2022/0291
Valid 30/05/2022

18 MILL CLOSE
CAVERSWALL

PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY
SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

The impact on the character and appearance of the area.
The impact on residential amenity

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The site is within the built-up part of Cookshill (just west of Caverswall village), defined as a “Smaller Village” in the Local Plan and excluded from the Green Belt. The site is on the western edge of the village on the west side of the Mill Close residential cul-de-sac comprising modern brick-and-tile dwellings facing the road, mainly semi-detached 3-bed houses such as the one on the application site. The land to the west (rear) of the site is open land in the Green Belt. There are other similar houses on the opposite side of the road to the east which also face the road.

PROPOSAL

This is a full householder planning application for a single-storey side and rear “wraparound” extension which would be entirely flat-roofed apart from a “false pitch” roof over the front of the side extension (above a proposed garage door concealing a cycle store) and the front slope of which would extend over an existing flat-roof canopy which spans the whole of the front width of the house. The extension would span up to the side boundary of the site and would project 0.75 metres forward of the front wall and also beyond the rear wall of the house by 2.0 metres. The existing garage, detached and the against the side boundary to the rear of the house, would be removed.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Staffs Moorlands Local Plan (adopted July 2021)

DC1 Design Considerations

NPPF (Revised July 2021)

Sections 12 (Design).

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

None.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 7.7.22

Neighbour consultation period ends: 7.7.22

Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

None.

Parish Council Comments

None.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Although flat-roofed extensions are generally resisted in the Council's Design Guide, the flat-roofed part would not be visible from roads, footpaths or the public realm by virtue of the addition of a false pitch at the front and boundary screening at the back (there are also no footpaths in the fields to the rear) which also conceals the rear elevation and the proposed fenestration (bi-folds). The "false pitch" roof and canopy lean-to roof proposed would improve the appearance of the frontage of the house. The extension would be built with matching red bricks. The design is therefore acceptable and in keeping with the street scene and not harmful to the appearance of the area.

With regard to residential amenity, the extension would not project further rearward of the existing rear wall of No.16 or further forward of the front wall of that property and so would not impact on the light provision to that property. There are also no side windows at that property facing the extension. The rear extension would project 2.0 metres to the rear of the rear wall of No.20 to the south and would clip the 45 degree line measured from the mid-point of the nearest ground floor rear window of that property, contrary to the Council's Space About Dwellings design guidance. However, the infringement would be slight, the height of the extension is limited with it being flat-roofed and I do not consider a harmful overall loss of light would occur to No.20. In any case, the rear part of the extension can be built under permitted development without needing planning permission as it would not exceed a distance of 3.0 metres from the rear wall of the house. In terms of privacy, the proposed windows would face the rear and would not face either of the neighbouring properties. Overall, the proposal would not affect the levels of light provision and privacy enjoyed at either property and would not harm the residential amenities of the area.

The existing garage would be lost and not replaced within the extension. However, current driveway and hard-surfaced parking area to the front of the house is wide enough to accommodate at least two cars and this is in line with the Council parking standards for 3-bed houses.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The proposal would not harm the visual or residential amenities of the area. The proposal would therefore comply with the Local Plan and the government planning guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : APPROVE

Case Officer: Chris Johnston

Recommendation Date: 21.7.22

X *B.S. Haywood*

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council