

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2025/0099
Valid 26/02/2025

97 HEATH AVENUE
CELLARHEAD

**PROPOSED 2 STOREY
EXTENSION TO SIDE, SINGLE
STOREY EXTENSION TO
REAR, PORCH EXTENSION &
CANOPY TO FRONT.**

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Design
- Amenity
- Highway Safety

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The site comprises a detached brick and tile dwellinghouse and its associated curtilage, situated in the Cellarhead Ward. The site is within the Werrington Development Boundary, where the Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan seeks to concentrate development. The proposed site is enclosed by neighbouring dwellings comprising a section of Heath Avenue. No. 99 Heath Avenue lies to the East of the proposed site and No. 95 Heath Avenue is situated to the West. The rear curtilage of the site adjoins open greenbelt countryside land to the North. The Heath Avenue highway runs adjacent to the proposed site on the South.

It is noted that a number of properties within the street have been extended; however the established character of the street has been retained.

PROPOSAL

The proposed development consists of a two storey extension to the East side of the dwelling, a single storey extension to the rear and a porch extension and canopy to the front. The proposed extension would allow for a larger kitchen / dining area, utility room and WC on the ground floor and an additional bedroom and ensuite on the first storey. The combined extended area would wrap around the principal, side and rear elevations of the host dwelling in a 'U' shape. Materials used in the construction of the proposed extension would include brickwork, chalk hill monocouche render, Marley Modern tiles and anthracite UPVC.

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

N/A

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 03/06/2025

Neighbour consultation period ends: 02/06/2025

Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

No public comments have been received.

Town / Parish Comments

Cheddleton Parish Council do not object to the proposed development.

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 Cellarhead. 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 Cellarhead, which constitutes a larger village within the 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 proposed 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.

Although the proposed side extension would add a two storey element to the Eastern side elevation of the dwelling, the proposed extension would reflect the style of the existing building in terms of the roof course to compliment the roof course of the side of the dwellinghouse. The maximum height of the proposed side extension would be set down from the parent building, thus it would be considered appropriate development in accordance with the Council's Design SPD, due to its subordinate nature with the parent dwelling. The first storey element of the side

extension would be set back from the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse, again reiterating its subordinate nature to the parent dwelling.

The proposed rear extension would be single storey, therefore 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. The rear extension would have a lean to roof, which would complement the roof of the host dwelling.

The proposed single storey extension and canopy projecting forward of the principal elevation of the dwelling would have a simple lean to roof to compliment the character of the host dwelling. The front extension and canopy would not be a dominant addition amongst the street scene and is characterful of the row of dwellings in its context, which a number of have single storey projections forward of the principal elevation.

Although the surrounding street scene comprises a varied selection of house types, a prominent feature of the street scene is the brick used in the construction of the dwellinghouses. Initially, the materials used in the construction of the proposed development did not match those used in the construction of the existing dwelling, as well as from surrounding dwellings in the area. The proposed development consisted of a fully rendered extension, as well as the host dwelling being completely rendered over. This would have resulted in the character of the brick built host dwelling being completely lost. Furthermore, the site is completely surrounded by red / brown brick dwellings, so a fully rendered house would be completely incongruous amongst the immediate street scene context. Therefore, the Council did not support this element of the proposed scheme.

The applicant submitted a revised plan following receipt of feedback from the Council, amending the scheme so that the front and side of the host dwelling and proposed extension remain completely brick built. Only the rear elevation of the dwelling and extension would be rendered. Brickwork, chalk hill monocouche render, Marley Modern tiles and anthracite UPVC would be used in the construction of the proposed extension. Thus, the proposed materials would now match the existing materials and harmonise with the surrounding street scene, not detracting from the character of the original property.

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 bound by No. 99 Heath Avenue to the East and No. 95 Heath Avenue is situated to the West. Therefore, it is important to assess whether the amenity of these neighbours would be compromised.

The proposed two storey side extension would be within close proximity of the neighbouring dwellinghouse at No. 99 Heath Avenue, to the East. Following the completion of a site visit and assessment of the plans submitted, it has been established that there would be no breach of the 45 degree rule to the closest rear and front windows of No. 99. The two storey extension would predominantly align parallel with the side elevation of No. 99, which is largely blank, with the exception of four windows. The four windows on the side elevation of No. 99 are all obscure glazed, thus it is clear that no detrimental shadowing or overbearing impacts would be caused on any primary, habitable rooms belonging to this neighbour. There would be one small ground floor side window on the two storey side extension which would face the neighbours at No. 99. An existing ground floor window and two existing first storey side windows would be removed. The new ground floor side window would serve the new WC, which is not considered to be a primary, habitable room. There is a new window at the rear at first floor level but this serves an ensuite bathroom. Thus the privacy amenity of No. 99 would not be impacted by the extension.

The proposed two storey side extension would be located on the Eastern side elevation. As the neighbouring dwellinghouse at No. 95 Heath Avenue is positioned to the West of the site, the two storey extension on the Eastern side elevation will be tucked behind the host dwelling on the opposite side to the neighbour. Furthermore the distance between the proposed two storey extension and the neighbouring dwelling would eradicate any chance of overshadowing which could be caused as a consequence of the erection of the proposed extension, due to a breach of the 45 degree rule not being possible. There would be no windows on the two storey side extension which would face towards the neighbours at No. 95 Heath Avenue, therefore the privacy amenity of this neighbour would not be impacted by the two storey side extension.

The proposed single storey rear extension would not create a detrimental loss of light into the rear principal windows of the neighbour at No. 99. After a site visit, an examination of the submitted site plan shows that the proposed single storey rear extension would not breach the 45 degree line from the closest rear fenestration belonging to this neighbour. Furthermore, the approximately 1.8 metre high mature boundary hedging situated between the proposed rear extension and the neighbour, would aid in preventing some of the shadowing impact on the neighbouring property. There would be no windows on the side elevation of the proposed rear extension which would face towards the neighbours at No. 99, thus there would be no privacy impact on this neighbour.

The proposed single storey rear extension would be within close proximity of the common boundary between the site and No. 95. Based on assessment of the submitted block plan, it is clear that the proposed single storey rear extension would breach of the 45 degree line to the closest rear windows at No. 95. Due to the East

to West sunlight trajectory, the proposed rear extension would cast shadowing over this fenestration during the morning hours. This being said, the fenestration which would be detrimentally impacted consists of a garage door and window. A garage is not considered to be a primary, habitable room which is reliant on natural daylight entry through its fenestration. Notably, the proposed single storey rear extension is very close to benefitting from a permitted development fallback position. Under permitted development, a single storey rear extension of up to 4 metres in depth, 4 metres in height and 3 metres to the eaves could be built at the site. The proposed extension has a depth of approximately 3.38 metres, a height of 3.52 metres and an eaves height of 2.58 metres, thus complying with the dimensions of an extension which would be permitted development. There would be no side windows on the rear extension which would face towards No. 95, meaning that their privacy amenity would not be impacted.

It is clear that the proposed single storey extension to the front of the dwelling would not breach the 45 degree rule to the closest window on the principal elevation of No. 99. Thus, there would be no light amenity impact on this neighbour resultingly. There would be no windows on the side elevation of the proposed front extension facing the neighbours at No. 99, thus no privacy amenity impact would occur.

No amenity impact would occur for the neighbours at No. 95 as a result of the proposed single storey extension to the principal elevation. The principal elevation of the neighbouring dwelling at No. 95 is set forward of the principal elevation of the site. The proposed front extension and canopy would not project as far forward as the principal elevation of No. 95, thus meaning that no breach of the 45 degree rule could occur. Furthermore, there would be no side windows on the front extension which would face towards the neighbours at No. 95, meaning that privacy amenity impact would not occur.

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. Despite the increase in the number of bedrooms, it is clear that the driveway to the front of the dwelling would be sufficient in providing the three off road parking spaces which would meet the Councils parking guidelines. Furthermore, the proposed extension would not compromise the available off-highway parking at the site, in compliance with Policy T1.

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

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 the character of the host dwelling, wider area, neighbour amenity and no overall impact on highway safety, it is deemed acceptable under planning policy. Therefore, the proposed development is recommended for approval, subject to compliance with all conditions.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

Case Officer: Hannah Varley

Recommendation Date: 02/06/2025

X 

Signed by: Jane Curley

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council