DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2023/0400 **Valid 21/08/2023**	**157 HIGH LANE** **BROWN EDGE**	**REAR AND SIDE EXTENSION INC. ALTERATIONS TO FRONT ELEVATION** **(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)**

MAIN ISSUES

- Design
- Amenity
- Highway Safety

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The site comprises a detached brick and tile dwellinghouse and its associated curtilage, situated in the Brown Edge and Endon Ward. The site is also within the Brown Edge development boundary, where positive development is encouraged to be concentrated. The proposed site is enclosed by neighbouring dwellings comprising a section of High Lane. Rownall, No. 159 High Lane is situated to the North-East of the site and No. 155 High Lane is located to the South-West. The rear curtilage of the site adjoins an approved residential development and wildlife pond and habitat site accessed Land off Sytch Road, Brown Edge. The High Lane highway runs adjacent to the proposed site on the South-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 rear and side extension with alterations to the front elevation. The proposed extension would replace existing single storey side and rear extensions. Alterations to the principal elevation of the dwelling consist of a canopy extending across the full width of the dwelling and the addition of a bay window. The proposed extension would allow for a garden room on the lower ground floor, a larger kitchen, a garage and a WC on the ground floor and an additional bedroom and ensuite on the first storey.

The proposed two storey side extension would have a length of approximately 9.20 metres across the South-Western side elevation of the dwelling and a width of approximately 2.32 metres. The total maximum height of the two storey side extension would be approximately 7.62 metres and the maximum eaves height is approximately 5.02 metres. The two storey rear extension would have a width of approximately 7.11 metres and a depth beyond the rear wall of the dwelling of 4.66

metres. It would have a maximum height of 7.44 metres. The eaves height differs on one side of the proposed rear extension to the other; measuring approximately 5.06 metres on the North-East side and 3.62 metres on the South-West side measured from the highest ground level.

The extensions would be constructed from materials which would harmonise with the existing dwellinghouse, including facing brick, plain concrete tiles and UPVC / aluminium.

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

SMD/2022/0599 - Alterations and refurbishment of existing detached property including two storey side and two storey rear extensions. Approved.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 24/10/2023
Neighbour consultation period ends: 28/09/2023
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

No public comments have been received.

Town / Parish Comments

No comments have been received from Brown Edge 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 concentrated focus on future growth is to be directed to larger settlements, including Brown Edge. 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 Brown Edge, 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 ensuring that all development enhances the character and appearance of the settlement.

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 rear and side extension with alterations to the front elevation.

Although the proposed side extension would add a two storey element to the South-Western side elevation of the dwelling, the proposed extension would reflect the style of the existing building in terms of the hipped roof course to compliment the roof of the dwellinghouse and other dwellings amongst the streetscape. The first storey element of the side extension would be set back from the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse, showing how the extension would be subordinate to the parent dwelling in this sense.

Initially, the eaves and maximum height of the proposed side and rear extensions were not set down from the parent building, thus the extensions were not considered appropriate development in accordance with the Council's Design SPD. As the proposed extensions would have matched the height of the host dwellinghouse, they were not considered to be subservient to the host dwelling. Revised plans have been submitted since the concern was raised, reducing the height of both the two storey side and rear extensions. The reduction in the height of the side and rear extension is considered to be substantial enough to ensure that it is subordinate to the parent dwelling, thus it is now considered acceptable.

The site comprises a well-proportioned detached dwellinghouse. The proposed two storey rear and side extensions have widths which would cover the majority of the rear and side elevations of the original dwelling. The bulky size and excessive width of the two storey side and rear extensions appear visually dominant over the original rear and side elevations and therefore are not considered to have a subordinate relationship with the parent dwelling in line with the Design Guide SPD. The character of the rear elevation of the original dwelling would be lost as a result of the proposed extension, as it is no longer possible to read the original elevation of the dwelling.

Whilst the rear extension is not subordinate to the host dwelling, it is considered that the rear extension would not form a prominent addition in the area / amongst the street scene. It would not be visible from the public domain due to it being located to the rear of the dwelling and being set within a spacious plots. On balance, although the proposed rear extension would conflict with the Design Guide SPD, its' limited visibility from the wider public domain would not result in a visually harmful addition to the dwelling. Furthermore, the two storey side extension as presented to the Council under the revised plans submitted constitutes a standard, subordinate extension which would be considered acceptable by the Council in most cases.

The proposed canopy to the front of the dwelling would extend across the full width of the principal elevation. This feature is not considered to be a dominant addition in the street scene and is not believed to be out of character with the surrounding dwellings, some of which have canopy style features on their principal elevations. Furthermore the addition of the bay window to the principal elevation of the dwelling

is considered acceptable in the context of the streetscape, as bay windows can be seen on a number of surrounding dwellings.

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. 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. Facing brick, plain concrete tiles and UPVC / aluminium 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 property.

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 Rownall, No. 159 High Lane to the North-East and No. 155 High Lane to the South-West. 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 South-Western side elevation. As the neighbouring dwellinghouse at Rownall, No. 159 High Lane is positioned to the North-East of the site, the two storey extension on the South-Western side elevation will be tucked behind the host dwelling on the opposite side to the neighbour. Thus, it is clear that the light amenity of the neighbouring dwelling at Rownall would not be impacted at all by this extension. Furthermore, the distance between and positioning of the proposed two storey side extension and the neighbouring dwelling would eradicate any minor chance of overshadowing which could be caused as a consequence of the erection of the proposed side extension. The two storey rear extension would not impact the amenity of the neighbours at No. 159 due to their North-Easterly positioning in relation to the site. Due to the East to West sunlight trajectory, the proposed rear extension could only cause some shadowing during the later afternoon hours, which is not seen to be detrimental to the light amenity of this neighbour which itself has an existing rear projection, which appears to be part of the garage adjacent to the boundary. The nearest ground floor principal window is some distance away. There appears to be a principal window in the rear elevation above the garage but the relationship here is effectively a single storey and taking into account the hipped roof on the extension is deemed to be acceptable .

The proposed two storey side extension would run predominantly parallel with the side wall of No. 155 High Lane. There is a side window in no 155 but this appears to be secondary. The extension would not cause a breach of the 45 degree rule from the corner of the side extension closest to the neighbour and this neighbours' closest rear fenestration. Despite the two storey rear extension slightly breaching the 45 degree rule to the neighbours closest rear fenestration, I note that the corner of the extension closest to this neighbour will be at a reduced eaves height to the other side of the extension. As the rear extension would be set inwards from the side elevation and would only measure 3.62 metres to the eaves from the highest ground level, this would reduce any light amenity impact which could occur on the neighbouring dwelling. Thus, it is not considered that the proposed two storey rear extension would have a detrimental impact on No. 155 High Lane.

There would be no side windows on any of the side elevations of the extensions which would face the neighbours at Rownall, No. 159 High Lane or No. 155 High Lane, thus their privacy amenity would not be impacted at all by these extensions. Although three sets of bi-fold doors with two Juliet balconies and three new windows would be on the rear elevation of the extension facing towards the new residential development, they would not impact the privacy amenity of these neighbours. The approximately 19.5 metre distance from the rear elevation of the proposed extension to the common boundary between the site and any future neighbours would be enough to prevent any privacy loss. As set out in the Council's Space About Dwellings SPD, it is a requirement that there is a 22 metre plus distance between principal windows on rear elevations. It is evident that the distance between the site and any future neighbouring dwellings would exceed this.

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 three. For dwellinghouses with up to three bedrooms, two off-highway parking spaces are required under the Staffordshire Moorlands Parking Standards. Therefore, it is clear that no additional parking spaces will be required for the number of people inhabiting the dwellinghouse. Additionally, as the extended area would be to the rear and side of the dwelling, off-street parking on the driveway to the front of the dwelling would not be compromised, in compliance 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 design concerns were initially raised in terms of the proposed extensions not having a subordinate relationship with the parent dwelling, revised plans were submitted to address these concerns. Therefore, the application is recommended for approval, subject to compliance with all conditions.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

Case Officer: Hannah Hollins
Recommendation Date: 24/10/2023

X 

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council