

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2022/0025
Valid 20/01/2022

STONEFIELD HOUSE
TOMPKIN ROAD
STANLEY

**SMALL EXTENSIONS AND
FACADE ALTERATIONS TO
THE EXISTING HOUSE: NEW
GARAGE IN FRONT GARDEN
AREA: RELATED EXTERNAL
WORKS.**

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of development
- Design and visual impact/ impact to the Conservation area
- Neighbouring amenity
- Highway safety

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site relates to a detached dwelling that sits outside, but adjacent to, a Conservation Area which lies to the west. The property has previously been extensively enlarged via a single storey side, a part two storey and part single storey side extension, a porch and balconies to the rear. The front and rear of the property is rendered white and features a distinct gable-end that fronts onto a large driveway restricted by gates. The built footprint of the dwelling spans the whole width of a wide plot. To the west of the application site, there is a public footpath that runs along the side and rear of the property towards Stanley Head.

Majority of the buildings are detached and set off the road. The majority of the buildings within the immediate vicinity are constructed from stone, brick or rendered walls with tile roofs or slate roofs. The Conservation Area has dry stone walling featuring throughout.

PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for the external alteration of the property together with side extensions. Due to the extensive works, the following works are listed:

- Change in roofline from gable to hipped with additional rooflights
- New windows
- Change in materials from render façade to majority zinc cladding, stone to the front with timber infills/ doors.
- Erection of two storey side extensions to streamline the previous additions to the property
- Erection of a detached zinc clad garage.
- Erection of a single storey rear extension to serve a plunge pool with spiral staircase

AMENDMENTS

Amended plans were submitted by the Agent due to concerns raised by the officer regarding the materials, scale and bulk of the original proposal. The amended proposal seeks minor alteration to the materials used to the front and rear elevation however, the scale and additions remain the same. A heritage statement was also later submitted. The re-amended plan is the final plan which is to be assessed.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan (Adopted Sept 2020)

SS9 – Smaller Villages Area Strategy

DC1 – Design Considerations

DC2 The Historic Environment

National Planning Policy Framework

Section 12: Achieving well-designed places

SITE HISTORY

SMD/2015/0142	Part single, part two storey rear extensions, alterations to elevations including two rear balconies and front canopy porch	12/05/2015 approved
---------------	---	---------------------

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 23/02/22

Neighbour consultation period ends: 15/02/22

Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

Neighbour comments

No representatives received

Endon Parish Comments

Objection (original scheme): Whilst the Parish council are keen to encourage innovative new design we feel this application in its current setting is inappropriate.

The site is immediately adjacent to the Stanley Conservation area and the choice of Zinc and timber cladding as the predominate materials do not reflect the character of Stanley Village and we therefore recommend refusal of this scheme.

Severn Trent waters

No objection subject to informatives

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The dwellinghouse is located within the 'smaller village' of Stanley, as identified by policy SS9 of the Local Plan (2020). Policy SS9 seeks to allow an appropriate level of sensitive development which enhances community vitality, which would include the provision of extensions to existing dwellinghouses.

As there are no 'in principal' objections to the application the material planning considerations are therefore those including design, visual impact, neighbour amenity, whether there are any parking implications and drainage.

Design and visual impact

Paragraph 130 of the NPPF (2021) requires the design of a development to add to the overall quality of an area, by being sympathetic to local character and by being visually attractive as a result of good architecture.

Paragraph 230 of the NPPF (2019) requires the design of a development to add to the overall quality of an area, by being sympathetic to local character and by being visually attractive as a result of good architecture.

Policy DC1 refers to design and seeks to secure development of a high quality which is designed to add value to the area and to respect the site and its surroundings. New development should promote a positive sense of place and identity through its scale, density, layout, siting, landscaping, character and appearance.

Policy DC2 of the Local Plan seeks to conserve and where possible enhance heritage assets including their setting in a manner appropriate to their significance. It says that protection of such assets and their setting will be given as set out in the NPPF. The NPPF also seeks to conserve and enhance the historic environment. Para 200 says that any harm to the significance of a designated asset should require clear and convincing justification. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. In addition to this LPAs have a statutory duty under the 1990 Act to pay special regard to the desirability of preserving Listed buildings or their setting and that of Conservation Areas.

When considering the impact to the local area, the external appearance of the property together with extensions will appear stark and incongruous within the immediate street-scene. It is considered that the introduction of zinc, which will cover two thirds of the property, together with stone and timber cladding dominates the character of the dwelling and would appear out of keeping with the traditional houses viewed from Tompkin Road that fall within the Conservation Area and the public footpath in either direction given the dwelling's prominent location.

The heritage statement submitted by the agent noted that 'the development will have a neutral impact on the contribution of the setting to the significance, character and appearance of the Stanley Conservation Area'. It also noted that the metal cladding and hipped form would be contextual to the rural setting of agricultural buildings. However, the case officer would contest that the outlay and form to be more of a large warehouse within an established residential area that does not relate well with its immediate setting that is predominately dry brick/ stone featured. The officer recognises that the property sits outside of the Conservation Area, is rendered and the proposed works incorporates stone walling as part of the scheme to be relatable with adjacent properties in the Conservation Area, the counter argument is that the overall contemporary style does not blend well with the distinctive quality of the street-scene, the existing materials are traditional and reflective of its original

character that was part rendered and part brick and the stone walling is secondary to the cumbersome zinc cladding that is exacerbated by the changed building form. As such, the proposed development would harm the setting of the Conservation Area and therefore, not accord with Policy DC2 in the Local Plan and para.203 in the NPPF. Whilst this harm would be “less than substantial” in the context of the Framework, all of the perceived benefits of the scheme are private to the applicant. No public benefits to outweigh the harm have been identified. As such, on these grounds alone, the NPPF indicates that the application should be refused.

The extension also fails to comply with the Council adopted Design Guide which states “all extensions should harmonise with the parent building.” It goes on to states “New buildings should ideally be constructed from the same palette of materials used traditionally in the area. This means for the most part natural stone or brick for walling and Staffordshire blue clay tiles or slate for roofs.”

The Design Guide does discuss “modern” materials and states “*New materials need to respect the building and its setting. Occasionally, high quality modern materials may be used as substitutes or replacements for traditional materials in exceptional circumstances where appropriate to the design or setting, provided they harmonise well. An example would be terne-coated steel instead of lead for flat roofs. More commonly, modern substitute materials are less appropriate and often less durable*”. (my emphasis). It is not considered that expectational circumstances such as those cited would apply in the case of an extension to an ordinary domestic property.

The Design Guide also states explicitly at para 7.28 “*There is no tradition of external timber boarding in Staffordshire Moorlands*”. (my emphasis).

The NPPF states inter alia at paragraph 130 that decisions should ensure that developments will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development and should be visually attractive as a result of good architecture. For the reasons given above the use of timber here would not create a quality finish and would not be durable over the life of the development in the harsh Moorland climate. The NPPF continues to state that developments should be sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and should establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using (inter alia) materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit.

As there is no tradition of timber boarding in the Moorlands it would not be sympathetic to local character or help to create a strong sense of place.

It is noted that there are existing elements of what appears to be a composite cladding in timber finish on the front of the property. These areas of cladding are relatively modest but serve to show how incongruous such modern materials appear in this setting. It is noted that the extensions and alterations to the building of which these form part were approved under application SMD/2015/0142. In response to that application the Councils Conservation Officer commented “*Please ensure that there is no vertical timber boarding as this will be a material too many and not in keeping with the character of the area.*” The case officer responded by imposing a condition on the planning permission requiring details of types and colours of all roof tiles and facing materials to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local

Planning Authority prior to commencement of development. The Council has no record of an application being made to discharge the condition in question and as less than 10 years have passed since the development took place considers the cladding to be unlawful. As such it sets no precedent for the use of such materials.

Whilst metal cladding is a feature of modern agricultural buildings in the vicinity, the form of such buildings follows function and they are a necessary, if often visually undesirable, feature in the countryside to support modern farming practices and food production. Whilst such materials are common in agricultural development, the building subject of this application is clearly a domestic property. The large areas of glazing, other fenestration and hipped roof form are tell-tale signs of residential use. It is set within a ribbon of development in a village setting where such cladding is not prevalent, rather than being a stand alone property in an open countryside setting or part of a farmstead.

In terms of the scale and bulk of the dwelling, as noted above, the altered eaves and ridge height would strongly influence the scale and massing of the property. The Staffordshire Moorlands Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (the 'Design Guide') states that all extensions should harmonise with the parent building and that insensitive changes can spoil a building. The proposed hipped roof introduces a roof design that is not characteristic of the property or the immediate area. Furthermore, the catslide roof element connecting the main roof with the converted garage, the single storey flat roof with the hipped roof extension on the other side of the property appears clumsy.

Referring to the proposed rear extensions and garage, it is considered that the property has exceeded the extensions that can be added to the property particularly after the additions approved in 2015. It is also considered that the rear extension that runs along the public footpath is excessively large and overbearing as it spans the length of 14.8m with a height of 3.2m. As noted in the Supplementary Planning Document, all buildings can reach a threshold point beyond which further extension is just not possible without destroying their character. In this instance, the additional would be overbearing and would distort what was original.

Collectively, the effect would result in a dominant form of development to the front and side of the host dwelling and next to the public footpath. The proposal would be contrary to Policies SS9 and DC1 of the Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan (the 'Local Plan'). These collectively seek to ensure, amongst other things, that development is high quality, respects its site and surroundings. It would also be contrary to the Design Guide, as described above.

Impact to neighbouring amenity

Paragraph 127(f) of the NPPF (2019) and policy DC1 seeks to secure development that protects amenity, including residential amenity, in terms of satisfactory daylight, sunlight, outlook, privacy and soft landscaping.

The main neighbouring property that this proposal would impact upon are the neighbouring properties at Hillcrest and Horton House. Hillcrest's garage adjoins the applicant's integral garage and Horton House shares the border of the public footpath that runs along the side of the site.

Due to the distances between the proposed works and the main part of the house at Hillcrest and Horton House, the neighbour's amenity will be maintained. Furthermore, as the works will look to change the roofline of the property and create smaller windows, it is likely that the privacy from both properties will be improved.

The rear extension and garage are ancillary to the main house and does not cause any overlooking.

Taking the above into account, this application is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policy DC1 of the Local plan.

Highway Safety

Policy T1 of the Local Plan states that permission will only be granted for development incorporating adequate and satisfactory parking provisions.

The property benefits from off highway parking (driveway and proposed garage). It is demonstrated on site that the current parking arrangements can accommodate parking for at least 3 vehicles within the curtilage of the property and therefore meets with Staffordshire Moorlands Parking Standards. As such, the proposal will not have a detrimental impact on the adopted highway. This application is therefore considered to be in accordance with Section 9 of the NPPF and Policy T1 of the Local Plan.

CONCLUSION

The proposed works to re-model the dwelling, by means of its use of contemporary materials, new extended roofline together with an extension to the rear, is considered harmful to the character of the building that does not reflect the original frontage of the property nor provides a visual continuity with the adjacent properties that sits within the Conservation Area. As a result it would cause less than substantial harm to the setting of the Conservation Area and there are no public benefits to outweigh that harm. Therefore, it does not comply with the Council's Local Plan (adopted September 2020) and the government planning guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : Refuse

Case Officer: Lisa Li

Recommendation Date: 17/08/22

X 

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council