

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2024/0296
Valid 28/06/2024

ROSE HILL STONEY LANE
ENDON

**DEMOLITION OF MODERN
REAR SINGLE STOREY
EXTENSION WITH
REPLACEMENT NEW
REBUILD OF DOUBLE
STOREY EXTENSION AS
UNDER THE SAME
FOOTPRINT OF A PREVIOUS
HISTORIC BUILDING AND
DETACHED DOUBLE
GARAGE.**

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Design
- Amenity
- Highway Safety

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The site comprises a detached brick, render and tile dwellinghouse and its associated curtilage, situated in the Brown Edge and Endon Ward. The site is within the Endon Development Boundary, where the Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan seeks to concentrate development. The site is served by an access road off Clay Lake (Stoney Lane) to the front, as well as via a private road off Clay Lake to the rear. The proposed site is enclosed by neighbouring dwellings comprising a section of Stoney Lane and backs onto a section of dwellings on Clay Lake. Beechmount, Stoney Lane (the adjoining dwelling) lies to the North-East of the proposed site and No. 1 Wood Cottage, Stoney Lane is situated to the South-West. The rear curtilage of the site adjoins the curtilages of The Hollies, Clay Lake and Hideaway, Clay Lake to the North. The Stoney 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.

PROPOSAL

The proposed development comprises a two storey rear extension to the dwelling and a detached double garage outbuilding. An existing single storey outrigger to the rear of the dwelling would be demolished prior to the build of the proposed

extension. The proposed rear extension would allow for a larger kitchen / family room, a utility room and a W/C on the ground floor of the dwelling. The first storey element of the extension would allow for an additional bedroom and ensuite bathroom.

The total depth of the proposed rear extension would be approximately 9.80 metres. The extension would be staggered in its width; having a width of approximately 4.56 metres where it adjoins the rear elevation of the dwelling and 5.45 metres to the rear. The proposed two storey extension would have a maximum height of approximately 6.10 metres and a maximum eaves height of 4.20 metres (measured from the highest natural ground level).

The proposed detached double garage would have a width of approximately 7.2 metres and a depth of 6.08 metres. It would have a maximum height of approximately 3.90 metres and an eaves height of 2.50 metres (measured from the highest natural ground level).

They would be constructed from materials which would harmonise with the existing dwellinghouse, including rendered blockwork, brick and concrete pan tiles.

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/2014/0551 – Part demolition of existing building and construction of a first floor extension over existing flat roof and alterations to elevations. Approved.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 14/01/2025

Neighbour consultation period ends: 02/08/2024

Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

First Neighbour Comments

We own and live in the semi-detached house adjoining Rose Hill with our family. Both houses were built around 1873 on a private lane. Our property faces north while Rose Hill faces south. The proposed extension is to the rear of our house and would have a significant adverse impact on our enjoyment of and amenity to our house and our rights to light.

We were not consulted about the design of the proposed extension at Rose Hill in advance of the planning application being submitted and did not have an opportunity to discuss the impact on our house. As a result, we have to object to the planning application on the following grounds:

Loss of daylight

The proposed two storey extension would substantially obstruct the light entering the ground floor windows of our house. As most of our house is north facing, any loss of light to the windows on the rear of our house, which receive the most natural light to our living space, would adversely impact our living environment, property value, and the well-being of occupants. The proposed extension would reduce the light currently received to below the minimum level of natural illumination and we would have to use artificial light. All six windows and two sets of patio doors on our rear elevation are currently unobstructed by any part of the Rose Hill and receive light. The proposed extension would block light to all of the ground floor windows and patio doors (including to our kitchen and a living room) and obstruct some of the light to the three first floor windows. This would necessitate having lighting on throughout the day to use the affected rooms on the ground floor. The applicant did not submit a Daylight and Sunlight Assessment with the application and we ask that one is provided by the applicant before a decision is made.

We have a legal right to light over Rose Hill that we would seek to protect if the application was granted.

Overbearing impact and loss of amenity

A two storey extension of this size would be overbearing. Currently, there is a small single storey extension at the back of Rose Hill which does not impose or overbear. The proposed extension is four times the size and would have a detrimental impact on the amenity of our house. Due to the levels of the ground, the single storey

element of the proposed extension would be at a greater height than the ground floor of our house and although single storey, would overbear to a greater extent than a single storey building on the same level. The two storey element and the single storey element are also stepped in closer to our boundary wall. As proposed, the extension would remove our view of woodland adjoining Rose Hill and sky that we currently enjoy. Photos are attached showing the current view which will be completely obscured. They also give a sense of the loss of light that would be felt.

The proposed extension is to be built close to our boundary, only approximately 2 metres away, directly overlooks our house and does not provide the minimum separation distance at ground or second floor, including habitable rooms (kitchen, living room). Yet, it is possible for the extension to have been built much further away from our boundary wall given the extensive garden area to the side of Rose Hill and if that had been the case, would have a much reduced impact on our house and our amenity.

The design of the proposed extension as it faces our house is not in keeping with the design of our house or Rose Hill which are Victorian Villas. It has a modern façade which is out of character. It has windows overlooking our house, including our kitchen, living room, bathroom, toilet and bedroom, giving rise to an unacceptable loss of privacy.

Paragraph 130 of the NPPF sets out six criteria against which planning policies and decisions should meet and this includes creating places with a high standard of amenity for existing users. This proposed extension does not provide our house with a high standard of amenity and reduces much of the amenity that we have.

My husband and I both work from home and so will be impacted to a greater degree.

We would ask that you give consideration to our objection and bring it to the attention of the Planning Applications Committee and request that the application for planning permission is refused.

We would be happy to discuss an alternative design with the applicant which would minimise the impact on our house. Until around 3 years ago, there was a single storey extension with a flat roof which has been largely demolished and part left with a pitch roof. Replicating the flat roof extension would be acceptable as it did not interfere with our rights of light to such a degree that the proposed two storey extension would.

We would be happy to host a visit to our property should you or the committee wish to see the impact the proposed extension would have.

Comments on the Revised Plans

Thank you for sharing the revised plans for the above application. Applicant is prepared to make changes to the application. We welcome that however, we are still very concerned about the proposals even in their revised form.

The proposed extension would still have a significant adverse impact on our enjoyment of and amenity to our house and our rights to light. The bulk of the building remains two storey and continues to be overbearing and will still block out light to our living accommodation.

As a result, we have to maintain our objection to the planning application on the same grounds set out in our letter of objection to you of 20 July 2024, namely loss of light, overbearing impact and loss of amenity:

Loss of daylight

The proposed two storey extension even in revised form would still substantially obstruct the light entering the ground floor windows of our house. While the garage has been changed and in revised format is shown as a separate building. However, as a result of the higher ground level in its revised position and with a pitch roof, this would also still block light. The previous extension was single storey and the previous separate garage located in the same place as the revised location had a flat roof as shown on the photographs that we sent to you with our July letter.

As we explained previously, most of our house is north facing, any loss of light to the windows on the rear of our house, which receive the most natural light to our living space, would adversely impact our living environment, property value, and the wellbeing of occupants. The proposed extension would still reduce the light currently received to below the minimum level of natural illumination and we would have to use artificial light. All six windows and two sets of patio doors on our rear elevation are currently unobstructed by any part of the Rose Hill and receive light. The proposed extension would block light to all of the ground floor windows and patio doors (including to our kitchen and a living room) and obstruct some of the light to the three first floor windows. This would necessitate having lighting on throughout the day to use the affected rooms on the ground floor.

We previously asked that a Daylight and Sunlight Assessment be completed before the planning application is determined but we have not yet seen such an assessment.

We have a legal right to light over Rose Hill that we would seek to protect if the application was granted.

Overbearing impact and loss of amenity

Although the stepping in of the proposed building towards our boundary has been removed, the two storey extension of this size even in its revised format would be overbearing as it remains close to our boundary wall. As explained previously, there is currently a small single storey extension at the back of Rose Hill which does not impose or overbear. The proposed extension is significantly larger and would have a detrimental impact on the amenity of our house. In addition, as mentioned above, due to the levels of the ground, the separate garage with a pitch roof would be at a greater height than the ground floor of our house and would still overbear to a greater extent than a single storey building on the same level.

The revised two storey extension would still remove our view of woodland adjoining Rose Hill and sky that we currently enjoy. We sent photos previously showing the current view which will still be obscured. They also give a sense of the loss of light that would be felt.

The proposed revised extension is to be built close to our boundary, directly overlooks our house, now has larger windows overlooking our property and we believe it still does not provide the minimum separation distance. There is extensive garden area to the side of Rose Hill which could accommodate an extension that would be further away from our property and not block light, overbear or reduce the impact on our house and our amenity.

The design of the proposed extension as it faces our house is still not in keeping with the design of our house or Rose Hill which are Victorian Villas. It has a modern façade which is out of character. The revised larger windows overlooking our house, including our kitchen, living room, bathroom, toilet and bedroom, still mean an unacceptable loss of privacy for us.

Paragraph 130 of the NPPF sets out six criteria against which planning policies and decisions should meet and this includes creating places with a high standard of amenity for existing users. This proposed extension does not provide our house with a high standard of amenity and reduces much of the amenity that we have.

My husband and I both work from home and so will be impacted to a greater degree.

We would ask that you give consideration to our objection and bring it to the attention of the Planning Applications Committee and request that the application for planning permission is refused.

We would be happy to discuss an alternative design with the applicant which would minimise the impact on our house. As we explained previously, until around 3-4 years ago, there was a single storey extension with a flat roof which has been largely demolished and part left with a pitch roof. Replicating the flat roof extension would be acceptable as it did not interfere with our rights of light to such a degree that the proposed two storey extension would.

We would be happy to host a visit to our property should you or the committee wish to see the impact the proposed extension would have.

Town / Parish Comments

Endon with Stanley Parish Council have submitted the following comments:

The part demolition and rebuild with an additional single storey element to form integral double garage and utility space are all acceptable. They do not appear to impact on any neighbouring properties and the site is large enough to accommodate all that is proposed particularly considering the demolition proposals. No objection

Staffordshire County Council Highways

The original proposal was for single and double extensions to the property to form a kitchen, family room, utility, hall and double garage with an ensuite bedroom above the kitchen and family room.

The proposal has been revised to create a 2-storey extension providing a kitchen, family room, utility, lobby and toilet with an ensuite bedroom above. The garage will be detached as shown in the amended Block Plan.

The floor plan of the property will increase from 3 to 4 bedrooms. Staffordshire Moorlands Parking Standards 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 proposed detached double garage, measuring 6.5m by 5.4m (minimum internal measurements), does not comply with the internal dimensions specified in the Parking Standards for a double garage which are 6m by 6m.

However, there is sufficient parking space within the grounds for a 4-bedroom property.

I have no objection to the proposal (application number SMD/2024/0296).

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 Endon. 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 Endon, which constitutes a larger village within 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 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 applicant has supplied an aerial photograph from Historic England, which provides an idea regarding the former scale of the properties. This photograph has been copied below:



Figure 1

Looking at this image, it is clear that both of the pair of semi-detached dwellings have had two storey rear extensions in the past. The photograph demonstrates how

the two storey rear extensions had an acceptable and balanced relationship when the dwellings were first built.

Although the proposed rear extension would add a two storey area to the dwelling, 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.

Initially, the applicants submitted a scheme whereby the depth of the proposed extension nearly doubled that of the host dwelling, adding an excessive amount of bulk and massing to the rear elevation of the dwelling. It had a depth of nearly 19m, including attached double garage. Thus, the extension would have had a visually disproportionate appearance with the main dwelling, creating a dominant addition on the rear elevation of the dwelling. This was considered to conflict with the Design Guide SPD, as the extension did not have a subordinate relationship with the host dwelling. Furthermore, the fenestration of the extension initially included an apex window, which appeared out of character with the windows of the host dwelling, as well as four horizontally emphasised windows which conflicted with the vertical emphasis of the existing windows on the dwelling. Thus, it was considered that the proposed extension did not comply with the Staffordshire Moorlands Design Guide SPD, as it would not complement the design of the host dwelling.

Notably, a two storey rear extension was approved under SMD/2014/0551. The proposed extension under this application was considerably more simplistic in its design; featuring a simple pitched roof which complemented that of the host dwelling. The previously approved rear extension had a simple linear form, as well as a simple layout of fenestration which was proportionately acceptable. It was suggested to the applicants that they amend their plans to demonstrate an extension which would be a closer replica of this previously approved extension.

Following this, a revised scheme was submitted to the Council, reducing the depth of the proposed extension to 9.80 metres (slightly less depth than the extension approved under SMD/2014/0551). Additionally, the roof form has been changed to a more simplistic pitched roof incorporating two split eaves gable windows on the South-West facing roof plane and all horizontally emphasised windows have been altered to have a vertical emphasis. The design of the revised extension is therefore considered appropriate, due to its subordinate relationship with the parent dwelling and its sympathetic design with respect to the host dwelling.

The neighbours have objected to the proposed two storey rear extension based on its design, as they believe that it is not in keeping with the design of their house or Rose Hill which are Victorian Villas. They believe that the proposed extension has a modern façade which is out of character with the pair of semis. The revised plans now address these concerns and show sympathetic fenestration, reflecting the character of the host dwelling along with its adjoining neighbour. For all of the reasons stated above, the Council believe that the extension would be in character with the pair of semis. The design of the proposed extension would effectively mirror

the two storey rear extension at Beechmount and balance the rear elevation of the dwellings, as was the case in Figure 1.

Initially, a garage had been included within the space of the proposed rear extension. A revised scheme was then submitted, separating the garage from the extension so that it would comprise a detached outbuilding within the curtilage of the dwellinghouse.

The simple silhouette of the proposed garage outbuilding with a simple pitched roof course complements the host dwellinghouse, thus it is considered appropriate in this aspect of its design. The maximum and eaves heights of the garage would clearly be lower than the parent dwelling despite the outbuilding being on a higher ground level, indicating that it would be subordinate to the parent dwellinghouse. I note that although the garage would be of a large footprint, any size footprint of an outbuilding is permissible under Class E of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended. This is provided that the total area of ground covered by buildings (other than the original dwellinghouse) would not exceed 50% of the total area of the curtilage. Therefore, the garage would not compete with the proportions of the host dwelling, as it is clearly read as an outbuilding for the ancillary use of the host dwelling. Thus, it would be considered appropriate development in accordance with the Council's Design SPD.

Materials used in the construction of the proposed extension and outbuilding 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 and render. Rendered blockwork, brick and concrete pan tiles would be used in the construction of the proposed extension and garage. Thus, the proposed materials would match the existing materials and harmonise with the surrounding street scene, not detracting from the character of the original street.

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 135 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 bounded by Beechmount, Stoney Lane (the adjoining dwelling) to the North-East and No. 1 Wood Cottage, Stoney Lane to the South-West. The rear curtilage of the site adjoins the curtilages of The Hollies, Clay Lake and Hideaway, Clay Lake to the North. Assessment of amenity impact will therefore

be required on the direct neighbouring dwellinghouses to the sides and rear of the site.

The proposed rear extension and garage outbuilding would be substantially stepped off the common boundary between the site and No. 1 Wood Cottage and positioned approximately 30 metres plus from the closest elevation of this neighbour. Thus, it is considered that the distance between the proposed development and this neighbouring dwelling would be substantial enough to ensure that there is no breach of the 45 degree rule and their light amenity is not impacted through any habitable windows. Furthermore, the common boundary treatment between the site and No. 1 Wood Cottage in the form of mature soft landscaping would largely screen the proposed extension and detached garage from this neighbour.

The proposed extension and garage outbuilding would be within closer proximity to the neighbours at Beechmount. Initially, the proposed rear extension significantly breached the 45 degree rule to the closest rear windows at Beechmount, meaning that the light amenity of these neighbours would have been detrimentally impacted. Therefore, a revised scheme was submitted to the Council, reducing the proposed extension to a depth which would not lead to the 45 degree breach occurring.

The neighbours at Beechmount have objected both to the initial submission and to the revised proposals based on loss of light, stating that natural light entry into a number of ground floor and first floor primary windows such as the kitchen, main bedroom and a living room would be detrimentally impacted. The neighbours believe that if the extension would be erected, it would reduce their natural light levels to below the minimum level of natural illumination, meaning that they would have to use more artificial light. Furthermore, they have expressed concern regarding the proximity of the proposed extension to their boundary and the overbearing impact which it would have on them.

Notably, the approved extension under SMD/2014/0551 had a height of 6.50 metres whilst the extension presented to the Council today has a height of 6.10 metres measured from the highest natural ground level. Furthermore, the extension previously approved was approximately 3.70 metres from the common boundary, as are the revised plans, and not 2m as originally proposed. The proposed extension would have a slightly lesser depth to the previously approved extension.

Further assessment of the 45 degree rule has been carried out based on the revised scheme submitted, to ensure that light amenity of the neighbours at Beechmount would not be further impacted. The proposed extension would be a near replica of the approved extension under SMD/2014/0551 in terms of its depth but reduced in height. As there was no breach of the 45 degree rule when previously assessed, there would continue to be no breach of the 45 degree rule in this instance. If anything, the proposed extension would have a lesser impact on the amenity of Beechmount than the previously approved extension.

The neighbour comments (with pictures) that until 3-4 year ago the previous extension had a flat roof which did not impact on their windows. Whilst the proposed extension, due to its height would reduce the outlook from the neighbours side facing windows, it is noted that the neighbours rearward two storey projection does impact

on the current application site in terms of overlooking from a first floor window. As shown in the photograph below that there is a substantial boundary wall along the common boundary between both properties which restricts overlooking opportunities, particularly at ground floor. Moreover the height of the boundary wall already restricts outlook from the neighbour side facing windows. It is considered that the proposed extension, due to its siting would not exacerbate the impact on the ground floor side facing windows of the neighbouring property.



It is evident from the information submitted that both houses originally had two storey rearward projections and the current proposals simply reflect the scale, proportion and siting of these rearward projections. The neighbour comments that a daylight and sunlight assessment should be submitted, however this is not a requirement of the Councils validation list, and the 45 degree line has been used to assess this matter.

In terms of the proposed detached garage outbuilding, the neighbours at Beechmount have expressed concern regarding the levels of the ground, leading to the proposed outbuilding having a greater height than the ground floor of their house. They have stated that although single storey, the garage would overbear to a greater extent than a single storey building on the same level. It has been noted that the neighbours at Beechmount also have an outbuilding in the rear curtilage of their dwelling at a very similar ground level, which the proposed garage outbuilding would run alongside. Therefore, it would be unreasonable for the Council to refuse the proposed garage outbuilding on the basis of amenity. Arguably, the garage

belonging to Beechmount already impacts the amenity of the site in that it sits at a higher ground level than the ground floor of Rose Hill.

It has been noted that the neighbours at Beechmount have objected to the proposed extension based on loss of views of the trees and woodland near the site. Loss of a view is not a material planning consideration which the Council would use to assess the merit of a planning application, thus this does not comprise a reason to warrant refusal of the application.

The proposed rear extension would not impact the amenity of the neighbours at The Hollies, Clay Lake and Hideaway, Clay Lake. Due to the approximately 17.2 metre plus distance of the proposed development from the neighbouring dwelling at Hideaway and the approximately 35.70 metre plus distance from the closest elevation of The Hollies, it is clear that no shadowing would be cast over any habitable windows.

There would be four glazed areas on the North-East facing side elevation of the proposed extension which would face the neighbours at Beechmount, in the form of two windows and two roof lights. The neighbour at Beechmount has objected to the proposed extension based on privacy amenity impact, stating that overlooking would occur as a result of the proposed windows on this side elevation. As the windows would be at ground floor level, the common boundary treatment between the site and this neighbour in the form of concrete walling would be considered to mitigate any overlooking which could have occurred. To further protect the privacy amenity of this neighbour, it shall be conditioned that these windows are obscure glazed. Furthermore, as the proposed roof lights sit above natural eye level, they would not be considered to cause any overlooking on this neighbour. There would be no fenestration on the side elevation of the proposed garage which would face the neighbours at Beechmount.

There would be a large amount of fenestration in the form of one ground floor window, bi-fold doors and two first storey windows on the side elevation of the proposed rear extension and two side windows on the proposed garage which would face the neighbours at No. 1 Wood Cottage. Due to the substantial amount of mature soft landscaping comprising the common boundary between the site and this neighbour, as well as the substantial 30 metre distance between the proposed development and this neighbour, this fenestration would be screened appropriately and would have no impact on the privacy amenity of this neighbour.

Three new windows and a door on the rear elevation of the proposed extension would face towards the neighbours at The Hollies, Clay Lake and Hideaway, Clay Lake. Notably, the proposed detached garage outbuilding would be located between the site and these neighbours, blocking the impact of the ground floor windows and door. Although there would be a window on the first storey of the proposed extension, the plans indicate that this window would be obscure glazed as it would serve an ensuite bathroom. In any event the window would be at an oblique angle to Hideaway and a distance of over to 40m to the Hollies, which more than provides for adequate privacy for both parties. Therefore, no privacy amenity impact would occur. Two garage door openings would be located on the elevation of the garage

facing towards these neighbours, however they would be solid and therefore have no privacy amenity impact.

Highway Safety

Paragraph 109 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 extension would increase the number of bedrooms of the dwelling from three to four. Although this means that an additional parking space would be required for the number of people inhabiting the dwellinghouse, there is sufficient space on the site to accommodate additional parking. Although the proposed extension and detached garage would be to the rear of the dwelling where the off-highway parking is located, there is still a sufficient amount of space for off-street parking (including the garage) to the rear of the dwelling to accommodate for a 4 bedroom dwelling, in compliance with Policy T1. Staffordshire County Council Highways have reiterated this point, confirming that they do not object to the proposed extension.

Thus, the proposed extension and detached garage would have no impact on highway safety, in accordance with Policy T1.

Other Matters

The neighbour also raises concerns over property devaluation. Matters relating to property devaluation are not a material planning consideration.

Notably, neighbours have not been consulted regarding the final set of revised plans, although they were consulted on a previous set of revised plans. Neighbour consultation was not completed due to the fact that the amendments have been relatively minor. These amendments consist of the reduction in the depth of the proposed extension from 10 metres to approximately 9.80 metres and the alteration of all horizontally emphasised windows on the extension to being vertically emphasised windows. One vertically emphasised window has been added to the side elevation of the extension which faces towards Beechmount, however both windows facing this neighbour would be obscure glazed. Furthermore, the amendments made would further protect the neighbours' amenity as opposed to detrimentally impacting it.

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. As a neighbour objection has been received relating to the proposed extension and garage having a detrimental impact on their light and privacy amenity, a full amenity impact assessment has been carried out. From this, it has been established that as there would not be a breach of the 45 degree line from the extension to the closest windows belonging to this neighbour, detrimental overshadowing would not occur. Furthermore, the proposed extension and garage would essentially mirror the two storey rear extension and outbuilding belonging to this adjoining neighbour. Therefore, the proposed extension and detached garage are recommended for approval, subject to compliance with all conditions.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

Case Officer: Hannah Varley

Recommendation Date: 16/01/2025

X 

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council