

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2024/0485
Valid 11/11/2024

33 CHURCH ROAD
BROWN EDGE

**PROPOSED REAR
EXTENSION, ALTERATIONS
AND EXTENSION TO
EXISTING GARAGE,
EXTENSION AND
ALTERATIONS TO FIRST
FLOOR**

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

The impact on the character and appearance of the area.
The impact on residential amenities.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site is within the Development Boundary of Brown Edge and comprises a modern 3-bed detached bungalow with dormers in the rear roof-slope accommodating two first-floor bedrooms. The dwelling faces Church Road to the east. To the north are the rear gardens of dwellings facing Lingfield Road further to the north. To the south side is a two-storey stone cottage also facing Church Road. The rear garden of the bungalow on site expands downhill to a short cul-de-sac road to the west, "The Orchard" which has dwellings to the other side of it further to the west. There are also dwellings opposite the site to the other side of Church Road, on an upward slope towards the east.

PROPOSAL

This is a full householder planning application for a number of extensions including, primarily the replacement of the current gable sided roof with a new gable sided roof of similar profile and roof pitches above raised walls on all four sides i.e. raised eaves to allow the enlargement of the first-floor accommodation which currently has two bedrooms but with the new roof and raised walls, would accommodate four bedrooms in addition to one on the ground floor, equalling five. The new upward extension would have two half dormers on the front and the back. At ground floor level, a front and side extension would be added to the attached side double garage to enlarge it and which would also involve knocking into a link structure between the garage and the bungalow. The works would entail the replacement of a false dual roof pitch above the front wall of the garage with the rear part of the garage remaining flat-roofed. The existing windows and doors on the rear wall of the garage would also be removed and the wall looks to be replaced along the existing rear wall line. The other extensions include a single-storey rear extension using the same footprint of an existing conservatory. A dual pitched roof would be added with rear

gable. All the extensions would have brick and tile finishes to match the existing house.

The ground floor extensions, including to the garage, would be exactly the same as those approved in early 2024 under application SMD/2024/0098. The previous approval also included a front dormer but no other extensions above the current eaves level.

Amended plans were submitted on 28.1.25 to remove a proposed rear first-floor Juliet balcony and the change the design of the adjacent window but not the dimensions.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Local Plan (Adopted Sep 2020)

DC1 Design Considerations.

National Planning Policy Framework (Dec 2024)

Sections 12 (Design).

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

SMD/2024/0098: Previous approved extensions. Not implemented.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 9.1.25
Neighbour consultation period ends: 9.1.25.
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

None.

Town / Parish Comments

No objection.

OFFICER COMMENTS

The site lies within the Brown Edge development boundary where policies SS2 and SS8 apply. As a larger village where development will be permitted which meets the housing requirements and employment needs, the principle of development is considered to be acceptable. However this is subject to compliance with design and amenity policies.

Design and impact on street scene

Policy DC1 sets out that new development should be well designed and reinforce local distinctiveness by contributing to and complementing the character and heritage of an area. In particular development should be designed to respect the site and its surroundings and promote a positive sense of place and identity through its scale, height, density, layout, siting, landscaping character and appearance.

The adopted Design Guide states at paragraph 5.2 that:

Alterations need to be undertaken with care. Insensitive changes can easily spoil a building. The key to a sensitive approach is to take note of what is there already before preparing the design and to work with and not against the buildings character. The aim should be to revitalise the building without altering its fundamental character.

Paragraph 5.5 continues:

All 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 proposal would radically change the form of the dwelling from a bungalow to two-storey house, albeit with lower than average eaves height. There would be a max ridge height increase from 5.4m to 7.4m, an increase of 2.0m. The current bungalow appears to have the same ridge height as the adjacent stone cottage, despite this having two stories. All the other dwellings on this side of the road are also bungalows which do not appear to exceed the height of the current bungalow and adjacent cottage. There are some taller more conventional two-storey dwellings on this side of the road but further round the bend towards the south. The street scene comprises dwellings facing the straight section of road that the application site lies on. The proposal would result, due to the significant height increase, in the proposed house appearing to dominate the cottage in the street scene and there is only a 2m gap separating the two dwellings. It would also be significantly taller than all the other dwellings on this side of the straight section of road. Although there are taller dwellings than the current bungalow on the opposite side of the road to the east, the nature of development is more sporadic here with a mix of house styles whilst the dwellings on the west side are predominantly bungalows with the stone cottage standing out as an exception.

It is considered the proposed house would appear out of place on this side of the road. The significantly taller height, in dominating the adjacent cottage and also appearing significantly taller than the other dwellings on this side of the road and section of road, which are bungalows, would be out of keeping and harmful to the street scene and therefore also harmful to the overall character and appearance of the area. The proposal would not harmonise with the surroundings, or respect the dominance of the original building and the context in which it sits. Accordingly the development is contrary to Policy DC1 of the Local Plan and the adopted Design Guide and therefore the application should be refused.

The extensions at ground floor level are the same as those approved last year and would not be discordant with the rest of the resultant dwelling.

Impact on residential amenity

With regard to residential amenity, the raising in height of the bungalow would not have a significant harmful impact on the adjacent cottage as the raised section would not break any 45 degree lines measured from the front and rear windows of the cottage and therefore would comply with the Council's Space About Dwellings SPG. The only new window facing the cottage would be a small first-floor shower room windows placed in the side gable. This would not lead to any overlooking into any of the cottage windows or garden. The proposed rear bedroom windows would not result in any greater degree of overlooking of the gardens to the south than the existing rear bedroom windows contained in dormers. The proposal would not result in any significant loss of light or privacy affecting the residents to the south.

There is a significant distance from the dwelling to the side boundary to the north and the raised dwelling would not result in any significant loss of light affecting the properties to the north. The original plans proposed a large floor to ceiling rear bedroom window with Juliet balcony. It was considered this would lead to a high degree of overlooking of the back gardens to the north, when leaning over the balcony to the extent that the level of privacy to those properties when the occupants use their back gardens, would be harmed. However, amended plans remove the balcony and the scope of overlooking from the floor to ceiling rear bedroom window towards the north, would be no worse than the existing rear bedroom windows. There are no new north-facing windows proposed. Overall, the amended plans would not result in any harms to the residential amenities of the properties to the north.

Although the large floor to ceiling window does not entirely harmonise with the rest of the dwelling, this is a modern dwelling and it is on the rear elevation where it cannot be seen easily from the public realm or from other residential properties for that matter. The applicant wanted to retain the window size and shape to make use of views of the countryside to the west from the master bedroom.

Highway and parking considerations

With regard to parking provision, although the proposal would result in a 3-bed property becoming a 5-bed property, there is enough space on the driveway for at least three cars, which complies with the Council parking standards.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The proposed extensions, by virtue of the significant height increase, would harm the visual amenities of the area and would therefore not comply with the Council's Local Plan or the government planning guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE

Case Officer: Chris Johnston
Recommendation Date: 10.3.25

X 

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council