DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2023/0401 **Valid 08/08/2023**	**9 WINDSOR DRIVE** **LEEK**	**TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AND SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION** **(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)**

MAIN ISSUES

- Design
- Amenity
- Highway Safety

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The site comprises a semi-detached brick and tile dwellinghouse and its associated curtilage, situated in the Leek North Ward. The site is within the Leek Development Boundary, where the Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan seeks to concentrate development. The proposed site is enclosed by neighbouring dwellings comprising a section of Windsor Drive. No. 11 Windsor Drive (the adjoining semi-detached dwelling) is situated to the North of the site and No. 7 Windsor Drive is located to the South. The rear curtilage of the site adjoins the curtilage of Beresford Memorial Church of England First School to the West. The Windsor Drive highway runs adjacent to the proposed site on the East.

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

PROPOSAL

The proposed development comprises a two storey side extension on the South facing side elevation and a single storey rear extension. The proposed extensions would allow for a larger kitchen / diner, a larger garage, a WC and a utility room on the ground floor and two additional bedrooms and an ensuite on the first storey.

The proposed two storey side extension would have a length of approximately 9.14 metres across the Southern side elevation of the dwelling and a width of approximately 3.70 metres. The total maximum height of the two storey side extension would be approximately 7.40 metres and the maximum eaves height is approximately 5.02 metres. The single storey rear extension would have a width of approximately 5.82 metres and a depth beyond the rear wall of the dwelling of 2.59 metres. It would have a maximum height of 3.38 metres and an eaves height of approximately 2.56 metres.

The extensions would be constructed from materials which would harmonise with the existing dwellinghouse, including brick, off-white render, profiled concrete 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
SS5 Leek 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

N/A

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 09/10/2023
Neighbour consultation period ends: 21/09/2023
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

No public comments have been received.

Town / Parish Comments

No objection

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 Leek. 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 SS5, new development should be directed to the most sustainable locations. The site lies within the market town of Leek, 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 two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension.

The proposed two storey side extension would have a length of approximately 9.14 metres across the Southern side elevation of the dwelling and a width of approximately 3.70 metres. The total maximum height of the two storey side extension would be approximately 7.40 metres and the maximum eaves height is approximately 5.02 metres. The single storey rear extension would have a width of approximately 5.82 metres and a depth beyond the rear wall of the dwelling of 2.59

metres. It would have a maximum height of 3.38 metres and an eaves height of approximately 2.56 metres.

Although the proposed side extension would add a two storey element to the Southern side elevation of the dwelling, the proposed extension would reflect the style of the existing building in terms of the roof course to compliment the roof course of the side of the dwellinghouse. The maximum height of the proposed side extension would be set down from the parent building, as well as follow the course of the original dwellinghouse, thus it would be considered appropriate development in accordance with the Council's Design SPD. 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, avoiding any terracing and preventing mismatch of materials.

Initially, the proposed two storey side extension incorporated a front and rear gable feature. The existing roof of the dwelling and surrounding rooves of neighbouring dwellings are simple hipped rooves with a continuation of simple eaves lines. A gable feature would not be characteristic of the dwelling or surrounding dwellings, thus it would be considered incongruous and unacceptable in its design. Since this concern was raised, a revised plan has been submitted, removing the front gable feature to give a more simple hipped finish of the roofscape to the front of the dwelling. Although the rear gable feature remains on the proposed plans, it is considered that as this would not be visible from the wider public domain, it would not have a detrimental visual impact on the dwelling or wider streetscape. I note that a similar two storey rear gable extension has been approved on Windsor Drive under the application SMD/2019/0647. Thus, the design of the two storey side extension is now considered acceptable.

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. 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. The rear extension would have a simple lean to roof, which would complement the roof of the host dwelling.

Materials used in the construction of the proposed extensions would largely 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. Brick, off-white render, profiled concrete tiles and white UPVC would be used in the construction of the proposed extensions. Although render is not a material which has been introduced amongst the immediate surrounding dwellings to the site, it has been introduced to the principal elevation of dwellings further down Windsor Drive. Rendered elements are also not untypical on mid-twentieth century semi-detached properties of this type.

Initially, the proposed plans demonstrated that the entire ground floor section of the extension would be rendered. Render is not a material which has been introduced amongst the immediate section of the street scene, therefore it would not strictly be

in character with the predominantly brick built dwellings in this area of Windsor Drive. Since this issue was raised, revised plans have been submitted, replacing the predominant amount of render from the front and side elevations with brick. The only rendered section which would remain on these elevations is a band of render to replace the stone porch to cover any scarring of brickwork or damage to brickwork. Although the ground floor of the rear extended area would remain rendered, this would not be visible to the wider public domain and therefore, is not considered as harmful to the design of the dwelling. Thus, the proposed materials would mostly 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. 11 Windsor Drive (the adjoining semi-detached dwelling) to the North and No. 7 Windsor Drive to the South. Assessment of amenity impact will therefore be required on the direct neighbouring dwellinghouses to the sides of the site.

The proposed two storey side extension would be located on the Southern side elevation. As the neighbouring dwellinghouse at No. 11 Windsor Drive is positioned to the North of the site, the majority of the two storey extension on the Southern side elevation will be tucked behind the host dwelling on the opposite side to the neighbour. Whilst it will, project slighting beyond the rear elevation, it would not extend beyond the ground floor extension to the neighbouring dwelling. Furthermore the distance between the proposed two storey extension and the neighbouring dwelling would eradicate any minor chance of overshadowing of upper floor windows which could be caused as a consequence of the erection of the proposed extension.

The proposed single storey rear extension would align with a single storey rear conservatory extension belonging to No. 11 Windsor Drive. I note that the closest rear fenestration belonging to the neighbour at No. 11 is this conservatory. Thus, this room will continuously take in plenty of natural light from the West, despite the erection of the proposed extension. I note that approximately 2 metre high boundary walling and mature hedging is positioned along the common boundary between the site and No. 11, which will screen part of the side elevation of the extension.

There are no windows on the side elevation of the neighbouring dwelling at No. 7 Windsor Drive. Therefore, as the two storey side extension would predominantly run

adjacent to the blank brick side wall of the neighbour at No. 7, it would not cast a shadow over this neighbour and impact light through any habitable windows. The proposed two storey side extension would run partially along the side elevation of the single storey rear conservatory belonging to the neighbours at No. 7, which could impact light amenity to an extent, in particular during the morning hours. However, as this conservatory is the closest fenestration to the two storey side extension, the large amount of glazing would take a plentiful amount of sunlight from the South and West during the afternoon hours. Although there is a first storey window at No. 7 in closer proximity to the extension, the two storey extension would not breach the 45 degree rule and therefore, natural light entering this window would not be detrimentally impacted.

The single storey rear extension would be tucked behind the two storey side extension out of sight from the neighbours at No. 7. Therefore, no light amenity impact would occur as a result of the single storey rear extension.

There would be no side windows on the single storey rear extension or two storey side extension which would face the neighbours at No. 11 Windsor Drive, thus their privacy amenity would not be impacted at all by these extensions. Although a window would be added to the side elevation of the two storey side extension which would face the neighbours at No. 7 Windsor Drive, this window would be obscure glazed. Furthermore, it would face onto a blank brick wall. Thus, privacy amenity impact would not occur upon the neighbours at No. 7.

There are no dwellinghouses with curtilages which directly adjoin the Western rear curtilage of the site, thus no amenity impact will occur here.

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 increase the number of bedrooms of the dwelling from two to four. Although this means that an additional off-highway parking space will be required for the number of people inhabiting the dwellinghouse, the driveway to the front of the dwelling and garage would accommodate the additional demand for off road parking. The development proposals therefore comply with Policy T1.

Thus, the proposed extensions 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 concerns were initially raised regarding the design of the proposed two storey side extension, in terms of the gable feature on the principal elevation, this has been removed from the proposed extension. Furthermore, concerns regarding the whole ground floor being rendered have been largely addressed, replacing a large amount of the render which would be visible from the wider public domain with brick. Therefore, the proposed extensions are recommended for approval, subject to compliance with all conditions.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

Case Officer: Hannah Hollins
Recommendation Date: 09/10/2023

X B.J. Haywood

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council