

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2022/0673
Valid 24/01/2023

181 ASH BANK ROAD
WERRINGTON

2 STOREY SIDE AND SINGLE
STOREY REAR EXTENSIONS

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Design
- Amenity
- Highway Safety

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The proposed site comprises a semi-detached white / cream render and tile dwellinghouse and its associated curtilage, situated in the Werrington Ward. The site is within the Werrington Development Boundary, where the Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan seeks to concentrate development. The site is enclosed by neighbouring dwellings comprising a section of Ash Bank Road and adjoins a large area of open green belt land to the North. No. 179 Ash Bank Road lies to the West of the proposed site and No. 183 Ash Bank Road is situated to the East. The Ash Bank Road highway runs adjacent to the proposed site on the South.

It is noted that a number of properties within the area have been extended and altered. Many dwellings have undergone alterations of varying degrees including the introduction of render.

PROPOSAL

The proposed development comprises a two storey side extension, wrapping round into a single storey extension on the principal elevation and a single storey rear extension. The proposed extensions would allow for the addition of a porch, study, utility room, downstairs bathroom and larger kitchen / lounge area on the ground floor, as well as a larger fourth bedroom and bathroom on the first storey.

The proposed side extension would align with the ground floor walls of the principal elevation and rear elevation of the dwelling, having a length of 10.5 metres along the West facing side elevation. The first storey of the two storey side extension would be stepped back from the principal elevation, having a length of 6.14 metres. The proposed side extension would have a width beyond the side elevation of the original dwellinghouse by approximately 2.80 metres. The total maximum height of the side elevation of the dwelling would be approximately 7.50 metres and the maximum eaves height would be 5.40 metres. The proposed single storey rear extension would project beyond the rear elevation of the existing dwellinghouse by 3.0 metres

and would have a width of 10.16 metres. It would have a maximum height of approximately 3.86 metres and an eaves height of 2.56 metres. The single storey extension to the principal elevation of the dwelling would project approximately 0.9 metres forward and would have a width of 6.6 metres. It would have a maximum height of approximately 3.7 metres and an eaves height of 2.56 metres. All extensions would be constructed from materials which would harmonise with the existing dwellinghouse, including render, 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
SS8 Larger Villages Areas 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

N/A

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 21/03/2023
Neighbour consultation period ends: 24/02/2023
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

No public comments have been received.

Town / Parish Comments

No comments have been received from Werrington Parish Council.

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 more concentrated focus on future growth is to be directed to larger village settlements, including Werrington. 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 SS8, new development should be directed to the most sustainable locations. The site lies within the town of Werrington, which constitutes a larger village within the Staffordshire Moorlands. The Larger Villages Areas Strategy is based around areas where a 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 extensions 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 extensions include design, neighbour amenity and highway safety.

Design

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 two storey side extension, a single storey rear extension and a single storey extension to the principal elevation of the dwelling.

The proposed side extension would align with the ground floor walls of the principal elevation and rear elevation on the Western side elevation of the dwelling, having a length of 10.5 metres along this side elevation. The first storey of the two storey side extension would be stepped back from the principal elevation, having a length of 6.14 metres. The proposed side extension would have a width beyond the side elevation of the original dwellinghouse by approximately 2.80 metres. The total maximum height of the side elevation of the dwelling would be approximately 7.50 metres and the maximum eaves height would be 5.40 metres. The proposed single storey rear extension would project beyond the rear elevation of the existing dwelling by 3.0 metres and would have a width of 10.16 metres. It would have a maximum height of approximately 3.86 metres and an eaves height of 2.56 metres. The single storey extension to the principal elevation of the dwelling would project approximately 0.9 metres forward and would have a width of 6.6 metres. It would have a maximum height of approximately 3.7 metres and an eaves height of 2.56 metres.

Although the proposed side extension would add a two storey element to the Western side elevation of the dwelling, it would reflect the style of the existing building in terms of the roof course to match the roof course of the side of the dwellinghouse. Initially, the two storey side extension aligned with the maximum height of the host dwelling, as well as aligning with the principal elevation of the dwelling. The addition of the initially proposed extension would unbalance the pair of semi-detached dwellings, leading to them looking visually at odds with one another. I note that the surrounding pairs of semi-detached dwellings amongst the street scene are very balanced in their design. Furthermore, the gable feature on the extension would draw attention to the extension, demonstrating how it would not be subordinate to the parent dwelling in accordance with the Council's Design Guide SPD. Thus, it was essential that the design of the proposed two storey side extension was carefully reconsidered in order to reduce the imbalance in the pair of semi-detached dwellings as much as possible.

Revised plans have since been submitted, showing the eaves and maximum height of the proposed side extension to be set down from the parent building. The first-storey element of the two storey side extension would be set back from the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse, again reiterating its subordinate nature to the parent dwelling, due to its bulk being reduced. Furthermore, the initially proposed gable feature would be removed, creating a less prominent addition to the dwelling which balances more appropriately with the adjoining semi-detached dwelling. Thus, it is considered that the proposed two storey side extension would no longer compete with the proportions of the host dwelling.

The proposed rear extension would be single storey, therefore the eaves and maximum heights of the extension would be set down from the parent building. 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. The rear extension would have a lean-to roof, which would complement the roof type of the parent dwelling. Thus, it would be considered appropriate development in accordance with the Council's Design SPD.

The proposed small extension to the front of the dwelling would have a lean to roof, which would complement the character of the dwelling and would not be a dominant addition in the street scene. Furthermore, this design of porch can be seen on some dwellinghouses amongst the surrounding streetscape, including the direct neighbouring dwelling at No. 179 Ash Bank Road.

Materials used in the construction of the proposed extensions would match those used in the construction of the existing dwelling, as well as from surrounding dwellings in the area. Render, tiles and white UPVC would be used in the construction of the proposed extensions. 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. 179 Ash Bank Road to the West and No. 183 Ash Bank Road to the East. Thus, assessment of amenity impact will be required on the two direct neighbouring dwellinghouses to the sides of the site.

The proposed two storey side extension would not impact the amenity of the neighbours at No. 183 Ash Bank Road. As the neighbouring dwellinghouse is positioned to the East of the site, the two storey Western side extension will not cause any loss of sunlight.

I note that the proposed single storey rear extension would be on the common boundary between the site and No. 183. Based on the initially proposed plans, due to the East to West sunlight trajectory, the proposed rear extension would cause overshadowing on the neighbour at No. 183 Ash Bank Road during the afternoon hours of the day. There would be a breach of the 45 degree rule from the corner of the proposed rear extension closest to this neighbour and the central point of the

neighbours' closest rear fenestration into a habitable room, meaning that their light amenity would be adversely impacted. Revised plans have been submitted since this issue was raised, reducing the depth of the proposed rear extension from 4 metres to 3 metres. Despite the single storey 3 metre extension still breaching the 45 degree rule, adversely impacting the light amenity of the neighbours at No. 183, the applicants could erect a three metre extension in this position under permitted development. Therefore, a permitted development fallback position can be utilised.

The proposed two storey side extension would run adjacent to the side wall of No. 179 Ash Bank Road. Despite the site being on a higher ground level than the neighbour at No. 179, the only areas which would be impacted by shadowing during the morning hours are the roof and side wall, which the Council would not seek to protect. Thus, no adverse light amenity impact would occur through any habitable windows of No. 179 as a result of the two storey side extension being erected. The only fenestration on the side wall of No. 179 is a small obscure glazed window, presumably for a bathroom or ensuite, which the Council would not seek to protect the amenity of. I note that the ground floor side wall area comprises the side wall of a garage / car port, which the Council would not protect the amenity of either. Furthermore, the principal elevation of the neighbour at No. 179 sits forward of the principal elevation of the site, meaning that light amenity would not be impacted on this elevation.

The single storey rear extension could cause some shadowing over the neighbouring dwelling at No. 179 during the earlier hours of the day, due to the East to West sunlight trajectory. Despite this, there would be no breach of the 45 degree line, meaning that light amenity would not be detrimentally impacted. Furthermore, a large outbuilding belonging to the neighbour sits close to the common boundary between the site and the neighbour at No. 179, slightly aiding in mitigating loss of light for these neighbours. From these observations, it becomes apparent that the amenity of the neighbours at No. 179 Ash Bank Road would not be adversely impacted by the proposed extension.

There would be no side windows incorporated into the side elevation of the proposed extensions which would face the neighbours at No. 183 Ash Bank Road. Therefore, the aforementioned neighbours' privacy would not be impacted at all. There would be a small side window and a door with a panel of glazing in it on the side elevation of the proposed side extension which would face the neighbours at No. 179 Ash Bank Road. As the side elevation of No. 179 only has a small, obscure glazed window, it is not considered that any detrimental privacy impact would occur. Furthermore, I note that the proposed glazed areas would be on the ground floor only, reiterating that no overlooking would occur as a result of the erection of the proposed extensions.

There are no dwellings with curtilages which adjoin the Northern rear curtilage of the site, meaning that no amenity impact would occur here.

Overall it is considered that the residential amenity of the surrounding neighbours would not be adversely affected.

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 extensions would not increase the number of bedrooms of the dwelling, instead they would increase the size of one of the bedrooms. Therefore, it is clear that no additional parking spaces will be required for the number of people inhabiting the dwellinghouse. Additionally, as the bulk of the proposed extensions would be to the side and rear of the dwelling, the available off road parking, comprising two off road spaces to the front of the dwelling would not be compromised, in compliance with Policy T1. Although there would be an extension to the principal elevation of the dwelling, it is very small in size and would not impact the off-highway parking spaces.

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. Initial design and amenity concerns were raised relating to the unbalancing of the pair of semi-detached dwellings and the breach of the 45 degree rule on the neighbours at No. 183 Ash Bank Road. Revised plans have since been submitted to resolve the issues raised. Therefore, the proposed extensions are recommended for approval, subject to compliance with all conditions.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

Case Officer: Hannah Hollins

Recommendation Date: 21/03/2023

X *B.J. Haywood*

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council