

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2024/0542 AND SMD/2024/0544 Valid 16/12/2024	COURT LODGE LEONARD STREET LEEK	DEMOLITION OF A MODERN SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION, CONSTRUCTION OF SMALLER SIDE/REAR EXTENSION ON FOOTPRINT OF FORMER EXTENSION, INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS INCLUDING REPLACEMENT OF IRON RAILINGS
		(FULL – HOUSEHOLDER AND LISTED BUILDING CONSENT)

MAIN ISSUES

- Impact on a historic asset/ Conservation area
- Design and visual impact
- Neighbouring amenity
- Highway safety

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application relates to a Grade 2 Listed Police Station and Superintendents House including Stables and Boundary Wall. It is located south of the town centre within the Conservation area of Leek. The building faces Leonard Street to the east in a primarily residential area with some minor retail/ commercial properties nearby.

The former police house now dwelling is a detached Victorian red-brick and tile building. The building is part of a Grade II group listing incorporating the former superintendents house, police station, and outbuildings.

Court Lodge was designed by the architect William Sugden. The dwelling was previously used as offices, which included the construction of a single storey toilet block to the rear. There are some minor retail/commercial uses nearby but the area is primarily residential.

PROPOSAL

The proposal seeks planning consent to replace a single storey rear extension for a side and rear extension. The extension will be a reduction to what is existing and extend out 2.6m from the rear wall, width of 4.2m and feature a lean-to roof with a ridge height of 3.8m and eaves height of 3m. It will serve a toilet and extend existing lounge.

In addition, the applicant proposes the replacement of rails to the front of the property. It will match the materials and colour of the existing rails. Revised plans has been provided to demonstrate the elevations of the proposed boundary walls. Additional information has also been provided in regards to bi-fold door details and external materials proposed.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan (adopted September 2020)

SS1 Development Principles

SS5 Leek Area Strategy

DC1 Design Considerations

DC2 The Historic Environment

National Planning Policy Framework

Section 12 – Conserving and enhancing the Historic Environment

SITE HISTORY

SMD/2000/0890 Listed Building Consent for conversion of existing garages into meeting room and offices. Approved

SMD/2017/0033 and SMD/2017/0046 Change of use of offices into single dwelling. Approved

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 5/02/25

Neighbour consultation period ends: 17/01/25

Press Advert: 29/01/25

Public Comments

None

Historic England No comment

Conservation Officer No objection subject to condition requesting additional details regarding wall reinstatement and alteration to internal flooring

Parish/ Town Council No objection

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The application site is located within the Leek Town Centre and as such the principle of the development is considered acceptable, subject to the impact of the proposals on the historic integrity of the Listed Building, the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the amenity of nearby occupiers.

Impacts on Historic Assets

Policy DC2 of the local plan seeks to safeguard, and where possible, enhance the historic environment which includes designated heritage assets and listed buildings and conservation areas. In accordance with the Town & Country Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, development is required to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of a heritage asset.

Paragraph 212 of the NPPF states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Paragraph 214 states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

The Conservation officer has been consulted and noted the extension is of poor quality and is potentially contributing to damp issues where the extension joins the host building. The removal of this extension will reinstate the rear courtyard of Court Lodge, reviving the rear elevation of the host dwelling. The removal of the existing extension will include the opening up of an internal wall and installation of a bi-folding door. The proposed door is made up of 3, 14 paned panels. This is considered to suit the host dwelling, and is therefore acceptable. Officer site visit demonstrated that the portion of wall to be removed is a modern cinder block wall showing signs of damp. The opening up of this wall is therefore considered acceptable.

Furthermore, this extension is considered modest in size, and will reuse an existing door opening. As such no additional opening will be required. Window details of the proposed window for this extension have been provided (4 over 4 sash), which is in keeping with the host dwelling. The proposed extension is small in scale and does not require the loss of any original fabric, this is considered acceptable in terms of heritage.

In reference to the iron railing, the reinstating of the cast iron rails will enhance the heritage asset.

Internally it is proposed to install a new doorway to subdivide a large storage cupboard. The existing storage cupboard is considered to be a later installation, not original to the property. As such this is considered acceptable.

The heritage statement makes reference to the removal of the existing timber fence and replacing this with a brick wall to match the historical wall seen in historic photographs. While there are no objections to this in principle elevational drawings of this should be provided. Furthermore, informal discussions with the applicant revealed potential to remove a later concrete flooring to reinstate a sympathetic flooring. Details of this should be included in the submission, or in a subsequent application. The removal of the concrete floor is acceptable in principle subject to submission and agreement of details.

In summary, no objection was raised subject to additional details to the types and colours of the external rear boundary.

In respect of the comments made by the Conservation officer, the proposed extension will be an enhancement which will relate well to the character and form of the listed building than what is existing. The restoration of the front railings will provide much needed security for the occupiers whilst also, providing an attractive frontal feature that complements the period building.

Additional plans demonstrating details of the proposed boundary wall have since been submitted. These details are considered in keeping with the existing courtyard boundary walls. The wall is an improvement upon the current timber fencing and is considered to enhance the rear courtyard. These details are considered to overcome the omission identified by the conservation officer in the original submission.

Further details have also been submitted to provide details of the bi-folding doors and external materials for the boundary wall and proposed extension. The applicant has submitted these details in the view of overcoming the requirement for pre-commencement conditions. The details submitted are considered to be satisfactory, and in keeping with the listed building. These will not harm the appearance, character, nor significance of the listed building. As such the additional information successfully overcomes the requirement for a pre-commencement condition.

Therefore the proposed scheme will remove the previous addition to the host building reinstating the original rear courtyard, and front railings. The proposed extension is considered minimal in scale and will not result in the loss of any original fabric. As such it is considered that the proposed scheme will not harm the listed building. The case officer considers the proposed works to weigh in favour of being a public benefit as the works will revitalise the listed building as it seeks to reinstate cast iron rails and rectify modern additions in a sympathetic manner.

Given the above, it is concluded that the proposals accord with policy DC2 of the adopted Local Plan. The proposals will not cause harm in the contexts of paragraphs 212 and 214 of the NPPF.

Design and visual impact

Policy DC1 of the adopted local plan sets out a list of design principals which all development should adhere to in order to respond positively to the built and natural environment.

As noted in the earlier section of the report, the proposed works will rectify the previous structures that were added to the listed building and enhance the heritage asset. The proposals is in accordance with policy DC1 of the Local Plan and relevant design policies within the NPPF.

Amenity

Policy DC1 of the adopted core strategy states that new development should protect the amenity of the area, including residential amenity, in terms of satisfactory daylight, sunlight, outlook, privacy and soft landscaping.

No concerns were received by nearby neighbours which is expected given that the proposed rear extension will be reduced in scale and footprint. The rear extension will introduce a side window serving a toilet and bi-fold doors serving a lounge.

However, as the boundary of the site is well-screened by brick walls and fencing, it is not considered to impact nearby neighbours. Overall, the proposed works will improve neighbouring amenity and be in accordance with policy DC1 in the Local Plan.

CONCLUSION

The proposal would respect the scale and character of the listed building and would not adversely affect the amenities of the neighbouring properties. Accordingly, the application is to be considered to be in accordance with the NPPF and the Local Plan. It is therefore recommended that both planning and listed building consent are approved subject to conditions.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : Approve Planning Permission & LBC

Case Officer: Lisa Li C/O Rachel Robinson

Recommendation Date: 04/04/25

X *B.J. Haywood*

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council