

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2024/0257
Valid 31/05/2024

17 OXHEY DRIVE
BIDDULPH

HIP TO GABLE CONVERSION
WITH REAR DORMER, AND
PROPOSED FRONT PORCH

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Impact on character and appearance
- Impact on residential amenity

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

Semi-detached hipped roof dwelling, in a row of the same dwelling type. Located in an established residential suburb of Biddulph within the settlement boundary allocated in the Local Plan.

The dwelling and its neighbour share a central brick chimney stack, their facing elevations are painted render matching the other dwellings in the row. The dwellings in the row are of simple flat fronted form, but some have latter front porch and bay window additions.

PROPOSAL

The application proposes a hip to gable conversion that would make an addition to the side of the roof to present a gabled side wall to its adjacent, non-adjoining, neighbour. An enlargement would then be made to the rear of the roof with a large box/flat roof dormer that would span the full width of the elevation. The top of the dormer would exceed the height of the existing roof ridge by a foot (0.32m). A statement submitted with the application clarifies that it would not be feasible to lower the height of the dormer because it would be too costly and cause too much disruption.

The new bedroom would be served by a French window with Juliet balcony at second storey height. An enclosed front porch would be added to the front to replace an existing wooden frame cottage style porch canopy.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Local Plan Development Plan Document (Adopted 2020)

S01 Spatial Objectives
SS1 Development Principles
SS6 Biddulph Area Strategy
DC1 Design Considerations
T1 Development and Sustainable Transport

Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan

DES1 Design Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

HNT/2017/0016 Single storey rear extension. Prior approval not required.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 25/07/2024

Neighbour consultation period ends: 25/07/2024

Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

Two comments have been received.

One from the adjoining neighbour raising concerns over noise during construction, overshadowing from the roof addition and potential loss of light. The comments request reassurances that the Party Wall Act would be observed and that a partition would be appropriately installed.

A local resident submits the following comment and objection:

The proposals represent a clear change in character to the property with the removal of the hip roof feature. The roof line and street scene of this row of traditional semi-detached houses can clearly be read as a consistent style of design, and forms part of the character of the neighbourhood. The proposed loft flat roof addition protrudes above the roof line and is entirely inappropriate to the principle of design in this location and to the detriment of the overall setting.

Town / Parish Comments

Biddulph Town Council: Recommend refusal on design grounds, does not comply with policy DES1 of the Neighbourhood Plan that required sympathetic design.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The application site is located within the Biddulph Town Development Boundary where, in accordance with Local Plan Area Strategy, development of an appropriate scale and form will be supported in principle.

Design and Impact on Character and Appearance

Local Plan Policy DC1 requires development to be of a high quality, designed to add value to the area and to respect the site and its surroundings. New development should respect local distinctiveness and promote a positive sense of place and identity through its scale, density, layout, siting, landscaping, character and appearance.

The Council's Design Guide 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. In respect of alterations it states that 'alterations need to be undertaken with care. Insensitive changes can easily spoil a building...The aim is to revitalise the building without altering its fundamental character'.

The NPPF requires the design of a development to add to the overall quality of an area, by being sympathetic to local character and by being visually attractive as a result of good architecture.

The original dwelling is one of two semi-detached dwellings each with a hipped roof. The dwellings are in a row of other dwellings that are of the same distinct dwelling type. The dwellings have parity in terms of scale, design and character. The hipped roofs in the row have steadily, evenly staggered heights as the properties are set along the incline of the road.

Replacing the existing hipped roof with a full pitched roof and side gable would add significant width to the ridge and maximum height of the roof. This would introduce significant mass and volume to the new gable side. The new gable wall and roof would be constructed using matching brick and roof tiles. However, the increase in the ridge width and the mass of the roof would appear intrusive and dominant within the street scene at odds with, and disruptive to, the prevailing roof arrangement of dwellings in the row.

Moreover, the top of the flat roof box dormer on the rear would exceed the height of the dwelling's roof ridge by a significant amount and that protrusion above the roof would be noticeable and apparent from public vantage at the front of the property. That would appear as an awkward form of development that would appear at odds with the street scene and relate poorly to the character and appearance of the original dwelling.

The proposed roof extensions would not harmonise with the original dwelling and its neighbours. The design and character of the dwelling as altered would not relate well to the dwellings on either side. There would be harm to the character and appearance of the existing dwellinghouse, its relationship with the neighbouring dwelling and the character and arrangement of other development within the locality. The proposed extension is therefore considered to have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area and fail to respect local distinctiveness. It is for these reasons that the design of the proposed extension is considered contrary to policy DC1 of the Local Plan (2020), The SMDC Design Guide 2018 and the NPPF.

Amenity

Policy DC1 and paragraph 130(f) of the NPPF (2021) seek to secure development that protects amenity, including residential amenity, in terms of satisfactory daylight, sunlight, outlook, privacy and soft landscaping.

The adjoining neighbour is concerned that the dormer roof addition, of such a size and at such a height, would overshadow and take light from their garden and conservatory. However, the neighbour is to the south of the applicants property which would mean that the development would be to the north. With the sun rising in

the east, traveling across to the south to set in the west, the development will not cause shadowing or take sunlight from the neighbour's property.

However, the development would introduce at second storey height a very large roof dormer that would introduce second storey mass and create a three storey presence that would appear overbearing and obtrusive to neighbours who all have relatively narrow garden plots reflecting the dense arrangement of development and the modest scale of the dwellings.

Moreover, the large full height patio style window, at such height, would provide unreasonable vantage and opportunity to overlook the neighbouring properties from a height that is unusual in comparison to the neighbours and the locality.

There would be conflict with Local Plan policy DC1 in these regards.

Highway Safety

Policies DC1 and T1 seek to achieve a level of parking and an access that is appropriate to the development it serves. The existing dwellinghouse has 2no. bedrooms. The proposed roof alteration would result in the creation of a third bedroom. In respect of the Parking Standards contained at Appendix 2 of the Local Plan (2020), 2no. off street parking spaces are required to serve a 3 bedroom dwellinghouse. The front garden of the dwelling has been hardurfaced to create an area of off-street parking. Sufficient space exists for the parking of the 2no. vehicles within that area, in compliance with the Parking Standards. It is therefore not considered that the proposed extension will have a detrimental effect on highway safety. The development will therefore comply with policies DC1 and T1 of the Local Plan (2020) and the NPPF (2021).

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The proposed roof extensions would not harmonise with the original dwelling and its neighbours. The design and character of the dwelling as altered would not relate well to the dwellings on either side. There would be harm to the character and appearance of the existing dwellinghouse, its relationship with the neighbouring dwelling and the character and arrangement of other development within the locality. The proposed extension is therefore considered to have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area and fail to respect local distinctiveness. It is for these reasons that the design of the proposed extension is considered contrary to policy DC1 of the Local Plan (2020), The SMDC Design Guide 2018, Policy DES1 of the Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan and the NPPF.

The development would have an unreasonable impact on the amenity and living conditions of neighbouring residents because at the rear of the dwelling it would introduce significant mass and bulk at an unusually excessive height for the locality. This would have the effect that it would loom above and appear dominant and overbearing to neighbours. Moreover, a large full height patio style window at this elevated height and unusual vantage would give opportunity for overlooking and result in a loss of the neighbour's privacy. There would be conflict with Local Plan policy SS6 and DC1 in those regards.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : REFUSE

Case Officer: Ben Hurst

Recommendation Date: 26th July 2024

X *B.J. Haywood*

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council