DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2023/0359 **Valid 18/07/2023**	**HORSESHOE COTTAGE 14 CHAPEL STREET FORSBROOK**	**FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION TO FORM NEW BEDROOM** **(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)**

MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of development
- Design and visual impact
- Neighbour amenity
- Parking
- Flood zones
- Coal

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site is 14 Chapel Street Forsbrook, a detached, two-storey dwelling sitting at right-angles to the road and within a well-established residential area. There is off-road parking provision within the curtilage as well as domestic outbuildings, garden and patio areas. Boundaries are marked by timber fencing and hedgerow(s)/planting. There are no significant land level changes within the plot.

For the purposes of planning policy consideration the application site is located within the Blythe Bridge Development Boundary. The application site also partly lies within a Low-risk coal development area and part of flood zones 2 and 3. The property is not within any Conservation Area, there are no listed buildings/structures and no protected trees which need to be considered.

PROPOSAL

A first floor extension to provide a fourth bedroom. Natural light would enter the space by an eaves-intersecting dormer window and inwards opening French doors with Juliette balcony. External materials would be roof tiles and render to match the existing dwelling.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan

SS1	Development Principles
SS8	Larger Villages Areas Strategy
SD5	Flood Risk
DC1	Design Considerations
T1	Development and Sustainable Transport
Appendix 2	Parking Guidance

Supplementary Planning Guidance

1. Space About Dwellings
2. Design Principles for Development in the Staffordshire Moorlands

Supplementary Planning Document

1. Staffordshire Moorlands Design Guide

National Planning Policy Framework

Including sections:

2. Achieving sustainable development
6. Building a strong, competitive economy
9. Promoting sustainable transport
12. Achieving well-designed places
14. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

13/00743/FUL	Demolishing existing single storey flat roof building and erection of a two storey/ single storey extension to side of existing dwelling. Approved.
07/00984/FUL	Two-storey and single storey rear extensions and detached double garage. Approved.
06/01110/FUL	Two-storey rear extension, dormer windows, conservatory and detached garage. Refused.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice. Expired.
Neighbour consultation period. Expired.

Public Comments: None received during the statutory consultation period.

Forsbrook Parish Council: No representations received within the statutory consultation period.

Highways (Staffordshire County Council): No objections and no recommended conditions.

Severn Trent Water: If an asset is affected by the works, then the applicant will need to contact STW at the following email address':

- If the site is domestic, the applicant will need to please contact: the Build over team within Networks Solutions team at STW to discuss the proposals. The email address for the Build over team is: building.over@severntrent.co.uk

- If the site is commercial, the applicant will need to please contact: the Asset Protection team at STW to discuss the proposals. The email address for the Asset Protection team is: Asset.Protection@severntrent.co.uk

Environment Agency: Whilst the site lies partially within Flood Zones 2 and 3, the medium and high-risk zones respectively, the proposed extension lies wholly within Flood Zone 1 (low risk) and, as such we would have no comments to offer on the proposed extension.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The application site is located within the Blythe Bridge Development Boundary. There are no 'in principle' objections to domestic development within such areas, however other material planning matters must still be satisfied. The issues in this case appear to be consideration of design, visual impact, neighbour amenity, parking provision, development within a flood zone and the fact that the site is within a low-risk coal development area. It is noted that, historically, the site has been subjected to planning applications, a mix of refused and approved schemes which have been considered whilst assessing the current proposal.

Design and visual impact

Applications show that a ground-floor, flat-roof section attached to the rear gable end was demolished to make way for a two-storey and single-storey extension. It is upon the previously approved (currently built and in-situ) single-storey extension (application reference 07/00984/FUL) that the proposed bedroom extension would be built. Local Plan policies require that all development proposals are of a good design, including being 'designed to respect the site and its surroundings.' Supplementary Planning Guidance makes reference to extensions being subordinate in size. It is believed that the original two-storey section of the house is the part which is closest to the road, (the section of the building which contains the first two eaves intersecting dormers as counted from the roadside). Historic OS plans show a further section of footprint on the eastern side of the building, it is believed that this is likely to have been a single storey structure. Evidence of chimney stacks on both gable ends (previous site visit photographs and historic application plans), can indicate the gable ends of the building. In other words the building as shown on the 'As Existing' plans of the earliest applications is likely to have been the original. Together with previous additions, the current scheme could be viewed as being on the cusp of a disproportionate addition. It is borne in mind that this is not a Green belt or open countryside setting where the sizes of extensions are more strictly policy controlled. This is a settlement boundary location comprising differing sizes and design of buildings. In relation to the dwelling as it currently stands, the proposed extension does have a secondary relationship. It would appear that the previously approved (and built), two-storey addition is not exactly in accordance with the approved scheme, the roof ridge appears to be continuous rather than stepped down. Although the approved scheme does not appear to be have been implemented in accordance with the plans, it does not appear to have resulted in any harm upon the appearance of the property, retaining its elongated form, dormer design/positioning and render finish. There is no question that the addition is of an acceptable design in respect of suitability for the appearance of the existing building, site or its surroundings. The fact that the previous extension continues the ridge line means that the current submission relates well to the building. The bedroom addition would sit directly above the ground floor addition, it would be set back from the principal elevation and have a lower ridge-line and break within the front facing roof slope. There would be a clear secondary relationship with the current building. Proposed tiles and render would match those used in construction of the existing house and a condition could satisfactorily secure this. In this instance it is considered the proposal is acceptable in design terms, although it is questionable whether any further additions could be supported.

Approval of the scheme would not result in overdevelopment of the site or raise any other material planning concerns (each matter is considered within this report). There would be wider visual impact beyond the application site but given that the design of the addition sits neatly alongside the existing building, away from the road and the fact that this is an area of mixed appearance development, means that the proposal would not have visual impact harm. The approximate 90 degree orientation of the dwelling compared to the roadside ensures that the new addition would have less of a street scene impact than would otherwise be the case if it were closer to the highway.

For the reasons above it is considered the scheme is acceptable in design and visual impact terms.

Neighbour amenity

In terms of neighbour amenity the only dwelling that needs to be considered is the one to the north, number 16 Chapel Street. Whilst the proposed extension would be close to the boundary between the application site and number 16, it is noted that the addition would be wholly within the span of the gable end area of the neighbouring property, therefore raising no amenity relationship concerns with any windows within the front and rear elevations of number 16. Furthermore it is noted there are no windows within the gable end of the neighbouring house (No. 16). No representations have been received from number 16 Chapel Street. Whilst the proposed addition may take away light from the grounds of number 16 around the gable end area, a site visit confirmed that the land was used as an external access/pathway from the front of the property to the rear. No windows are proposed facing no. 16. However, a condition to prevent any from being added under PD rights subsequently is considered to be prudent. In conclusion there are no material planning objections in terms of amenity impact.

Parking

The County Highways officer confirms she has visited the site and provides the following comments;

The property is located on Chapel Street which is an unclassified road (Road No. D1179) with a speed limit of 30 mph and benefits from footways and street lighting. There is a no waiting at any time parking restriction along the section of Chapel Street fronting the property. The 3 bedroomed property benefits from driveway that can accommodate 4 vehicles.

The proposal is for the construction of a first-floor extension over the pool room to create a bedroom. The current 3-bedroom property will see an increase in the floor plan to 4 bedrooms. Parking for 4 vehicles is shown on Drawing No. 3276-SA-XX-XX-DR-A-0204,it is therefore considered the proposal meets with the Staffordshire Moorlands Parking Standards which state: Detached/Semi-detached property of 4 or more bedrooms will require 3 spaces (2.4 x 4.8m each space) for residents and visitors. The proposal does not have a detrimental impact on the highway network and therefore I have no objection (application number SMD/2023/0359).

The Local Planning Authority has reviewed these comments and confirms that the adopted plan does indeed require 3 spaces for a 4 bedroom property. The scheme is therefore considered to be acceptable in highways related matters.

Flood zones

Part of the application site (south-western area) is designated as a Flood Zone 2 and 3. The application is supported by a Flood Risk Assessment, composed by Smytheman Architectural Services. The document concludes that the scheme will not impact upon the flood zone as the extension will be at first floor level and drainage will be retained as per the existing

arrangement. The Environment Agency have been consulted, they do not object to the schem, commenting as follows;

'Whilst the site lies partially within Flood Zones 2 and 3, the medium and high-risk zones respectively, the proposed extension lies wholly within Flood Zone 1 (low risk) and, as such we would have no comments to offer on the proposed extension.'

Coal

The application site is within a low-risk coal development area. Latest advice contained on the Gov.uk website is that 'If you are submitting a planning application in a Development Low Risk Area then there is no statutory requirement to submit a CMRA to the LPA' however 'the proposed development still lies within a coal mining area and could contain unrecorded hazards.' The advice is that if any coal mining feature is encountered it must be immediately reported to the Coal Authority.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

For the reasons outlined above within the report, it is recommended that the application is approved subject to conditions.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : Conditional approval.

Case Officer: Lisa Jackson.
Recommendation Date: 20/12/2023.

X B.J. Haywood

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council