

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HNT/2023/0021
Valid 27/11/2023

ENDCLIFFE GEOFFREY
AVENUE
LEEK

APPLICATION TO DETERMINE
IF PRIOR APPROVAL IS
REQUIRED FOR A PROPOSED
SINGLE STOREY REAR
EXTENSION EXTENDING
5.10M BEYOND THE REAR
WALL OF THE EXISTING
DWELLING, 4.00M MAXIMUM
HEIGHT AND 2.50M TO
HEIGHT OF EAVES

(HOUSEHOLDER
NOTIFICATION APPLICATION)

MAIN ISSUES

Compliance with the GPDO (2015)

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The proposed site comprises a semi-detached brick and tile dwellinghouse and its associated curtilage, situated in the Leek South ward. Additionally, the proposed site is within the Leek development boundary, where positive development is encouraged to be concentrated. Lynton, Geoffrey Avenue is situated to the North-East of the site and Sandyways, Geoffrey Avenue is located to the South-West. The front curtilage of the site adjoins the rear curtilages of No. 22 and No. 24 Geoffrey Avenue to the North-West. The site is served by an access road off Geoffrey Avenue to the North and the Broad Street highway runs adjacent to the proposed site on the South-East.

PROPOSAL

The proposed development consists of a single storey rear extension, which would replace an existing extension. The extension would have a maximum height of 4.0 metres and maximum eaves height of 2.5 metres measured externally from natural ground level. It will have a depth of 5.1 metres. Materials used in the construction of the proposed extension would match those used in the construction of the existing dwellinghouse, including facing brick and plain tiles.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan (Adopted 2020)

GPDO (2015) Schedule 2 Part 1 Class A

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

N/A

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 08/01/2024

Neighbour consultation period ends: 20/12/2023

Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

Neighbours have been notified in accordance with the procedure outlined within the GPDO. No neighbour comments have been received.

Town / Parish Comments

N/A

OFFICER COMMENTS

In conformity with the rules stated within the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), it is necessary to assess whether the proposed rear extension to the dwellinghouse adheres to the criteria stated by Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the GPDO, to determine whether the householder development is permitted.

Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A.1 (a) states that development is not permitted if the use of a dwellinghouse as a dwellinghouse changes. The rear extension will be solely used as part of the living space of the residents to fully maintain its status as a dwelling, thus making it compliant under this criterion.

In accordance with Class A.1 (b) of the GPDO, the ground coverage of the building combined with the addition of the rear extension would not exceed 50% of the total curtilage of the dwellinghouse.

Class A.1 (c) and (d) confirm that the height of the roof and eaves of the proposed extension cannot exceed beyond the maximum roof height and eaves height of the existing dwellinghouse; otherwise the development is not permitted. Neither the height of the roof or the eaves of the single storey extension would exceed the

maximum roof or eaves heights of the existing dwellinghouse.

As the extension would not be constructed on the principal elevation of the dwelling, nor would it front the highway and form a side elevation of the existing dwellinghouse, this would be in compliance with Class A.1 (e.i) and (e.ii).

This is an application under the larger extension procedure of the GPDO, therefore Class A.1 (f) does not apply. Under Class A.1 (g), the dimensions of the proposed development are within those permissible. With a maximum height of 4.0 metres and a depth of 5.1 metres measured externally, the extension would be under the 4 metre height limit and fit within the 6 metre projection limit on semi-detached dwellinghouses.

The enlarged part of the dwellinghouse does not have more than a single storey and therefore, Class A.1 (h) does not stand applicable to the proposed development.

With respect to Class A.1 (i), if the proposed extension would be positioned 2 metres from the curtilage boundary of the dwelling, the eaves height cannot exceed 3 metres. Thus, as the eaves height of the proposed extension would be 2.5 metres, the development would conform to this restriction.

Class A.1 (j) states that the enlarged part of the dwellinghouse cannot extend beyond a wall forming a side elevation of the original dwellinghouse, unless it abides by certain criteria. There were no stepped side elevations on the original rear elevation of the dwellinghouse. Thus, the proposed extension would not be considered to extend beyond an original side elevation, therefore this rule is not applicable.

With regard to Class A.1 (ja), any total enlargement including the addition of further enlargements to existing enlargements, cannot exceed the limits set out in Class A.1 (e-j). The total measurement of the proposed extension would not exceed 6 metres in depth, 4 metres in height and 3 metres to the eaves. Thus, there would not be a breach of Class A.1 (ja).

The proposed extension would not include the addition of any new ornamentation features such as a verandah, microwave antenna, a chimney or flue or the alteration to the existing roof of the dwelling. Therefore, Class A.1 (k) is not applicable.

The proposed site does not fall within article 2(3) land, therefore Class A.2 does not apply.

The proposed development would be constructed from materials which would harmonise with the existing colours, textures and materials of the dwellinghouse. In accordance with Class A.3 (a), all proposed materials are set to be of a similar appearance to those used in the construction of the existing dwelling, including facing brick and plain tiles.

Permitted development rights in relation to the proposed site remain intact.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

This notification falls within the framework set out within Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A (g) of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015. Due to there being no neighbour objections being raised, there is no requirement to consider neighbour amenity, thus the proposal can proceed as permitted development. As a result the proposed extension is permitted development.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

Case Officer: Hannah Varley

Recommendation Date: 08/01/2024

X *B.S. Haywood*

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council