

Agenda Item: 5.3 - Committee Report for P/2018/01594**Report of Head of Service (Section 151 Officer)****This report has been checked on behalf of Legal Services by Sherrie Grant**

Application Number	P/2018/01594
Planning Officer	Gary Shilton
Site Address	16 Claymills Road Stretton Staffordshire DE13 0JQ
Proposal	The application seeks consent for the erection of a single storey rear and side extension, roof alterations to facilitate a loft conversion, installation of front dormer windows and erection of a detached garage and workshop (AMENDED PLANS RECEIVED)
Consultation Expiry Date	19 th March 2019
Screening Opinion	Environmental Impact Assessment not required.
Application not determined within Statutory time period- Reason	The application was called in by Councillor Killoran for consideration by Planning committee. Ongoing negotiations seeking amendments and this request have taken the application outside of the statutory time period, but the applicant has agreed an extension to the time limit until 26 th April 2018 to allow for the consideration of amendments and for the application to be considered by planning committee.
Details of call in	<p>This application was called in by Councillor Killoran for the following reasons:</p> <p>'In support of local residents who are very concerned about the proposed planning.</p> <p>They wish, should the need arise, to be able to attend the Planning Committee's hearing of this application, and when appropriate, be permitted to voice their concerns (I have explained they will only have 3 minutes).</p> <p>Concerns about the nature of the use of the garage and workshop. Will it cause the need for visitors to be parking in the already busy road, concerns about traffic safety?</p> <p>The garage/work shop shows on the plans to be re-located, causing concerns about residential amenities close proximity to neighbouring existing dwellings. Possibility of noise?'</p>
Relevant Planning Policy	<p><u>Government Documents</u></p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPF)</p> <p><u>Local Plan Policies</u></p> <p>Principle 1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development SP1: East Staffordshire Approach to Sustainable Development SP24: High Quality Design SP25: Historic Environment SP27: Climate Change, Water Body Management and Flooding SP29: Biodiversity and Geodiversity SP35: Accessibility and Sustainable Transport DP1: Design of New Development</p>

	<p>DP3: Design of New Residential Development, Extensions and Curtilage Buildings DP5: Protecting the Historic Environment: All Heritage Assets, Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and Archaeology DP6: Protecting the Historic Environment: Other Heritage Assets DP7- Pollution and Contamination</p> <p><u>Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)</u></p> <p>East Staffordshire Design Guide Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document 2017</p> <p><u>Other Policies/Guidance</u></p> <p><u>Stretton Neighbourhood Plan (Stretton NP)</u></p> <p>S4 – Wildlife Corridors and Stepping Stones S6 – Flooding</p>
Relevant Planning History	The dwelling has no relevant planning history
Consultation Responses	<p><u>Response to initial consultation</u></p> <p>Staffordshire County Council (SCC) Highway Authority:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No objections on Highway grounds to the proposed development subject to a condition restricting the use of the garage and workshop. <p>ESBC Environmental Health:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant is advised that the proposed development is situated within an area affected by Radon and request an informative to be attached to any grant of permission bringing the applicants attention to this. <p>SCC Archaeology: Developers should contact us directly to provide pre-application advice on the archaeological implications of any proposed development. This has replaced the former system where we responded to planning applications once they had been validated. Alternatively we can provide advice directly to yourselves, but again this would need to be on a cost-recovery basis.</p> <p>Councillor V Gould:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I am concerned that the proposed plan would create a building not in keeping with the locality and that residents nearby have concerns over the amount of traffic that would be visiting the property on a regular basis. <p><u>Consultation responses to amended drawings</u></p> <p>SCC Highway Authority:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No objections on Highway grounds to the proposed development subject to a condition restricting the use of the garage and workshop.
Neighbour Responses	<p><u>Response to initial consultation</u></p> <p>Representations have been received from 14 local residents from 12 addresses. Material planning considerations have been summarised below:</p> <p>Character/ Design/ Layout</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A similar development was refused as it would be "detrimental to the visual amenity and character of the area by reason of siting in 2008 at 17 Claymills Road, application PA/32196/002/MB. The proposed outbuilding (garage / workshop) would lend itself for easy conversion at some point in the future into a residential dwelling setting a precedent within our location. The development is disproportionate over development for the plot and out of

keeping with the rest of the traditional housing on Claymills road

- The proposed development is far bigger than any other property within the area as most homes are bungalows or semi-detached.
- Not in keeping with the adjacent streets and it will become a blot on the landscape.
- Claymills is an historical boundary of Stretton, as such future developments should be within keeping of the open aspect that has been maintained
- I think that the proposed building will be very large in relation to the plot especially including a “garage and workshop”. These buildings will dramatically affect the traditionally open character of the area.
- The scale of the building will occupy over double the present size.
- Object to the ground floor extension coming right up the perimeter fence of my border.
- I would also question how the proposed alterations may “compliment” the current local which dates to circa 1930. I would offer that the proposed architecture may well be more suited to Switzerland than Stretton.
- Proposal is over bearing out of scale, inappropriate and out of character in terms of its appearance compared with existing housing along the road
- Previous extensions have been sympathetically designed to be in keeping with the traditional aspect of the road
- Front aspect out of keeping with the rest of the traditional housing on Claymills road
- Concerns over the house being reconstructed to a three storey house
- If the ground extension was in line with current wall and not within one metre of our boundary then would not have any other issues.

Highways

- The plot is on the corner of Claymills Road and Shrewsbury Road and within a few metres of a severe 90 degree bend on Claymills Road and greater traffic flow from changing from a 2 bedroom to a 5 bedroom dwelling and or business activities causing more chaos to the already blind corner at Claymills Road causing even more problems to buses and local people.
- There have been at least 2 cars colliding with the front wall after taking the bend too fast. Increase in vehicles entering and leaving No 16 will add to the accident rate.
- Alterations to the northern elevation will reduce private parking.
- The current owners are running a Cake Baking Business from the property and the number of vehicles that are coming and going from the property collecting cake orders on such a busy stretch of road causing parking issues just into Shrewsbury road. I have witnessed an occasion where after collecting boxed goods a driver actually performed a three point turn in Claymills Road outside the property and opposite to my driveway.

Residential amenities

- Object to the garage and workshop at the bottom of the property, because the building is to be used as living accommodation for an elderly parent, hence the reason for the bi-fold doors. Therefore, if approval is given for these buildings can it be stipulated that the garage and workshop can never be used as dwelling or a business or used for animals.
- Light to our conservatory is not impeded at present. Given the proposed alterations, I would suspect that much of our enjoyment will be lost.
- There are no indications of what the “workshop” will be used for.
- I would further question the proposed “Garage & Workshop”. This, albeit sceptically, to me appears to be a somewhat gilded Annex. Has there been planning applications for full utilities for this proposed “Workshop”? Water, Electricity, Gas, Drainage.
- Concern about the use of the garage and workshop over 10 metres wide occupying the width of the garden and 8m into the garden, hours of work, noise levels, odours and subsequent disturbances as it appears to occupy a large area at the bottom of the garden.
- Loss of natural sunlight in the morning and early evening being overshadowed by a brick wall.
- Concerns over the height and potential noise from the garage and workshop causing a disturbance to the quiet enjoyment of the garden
- Currently have both ground floor, and first floor Western elevation windows that will be hugely impacted by the proposed modifications to 16 Claymills Road. We currently have a vista which provides a certain amount of light, albeit not huge, but this would, in my opinion be fairly well impeded

- Overlooking from the proposal, out of character with established bungalows in the area.
- Proposed upstairs windows would mean a loss of privacy to property to the rear
- Height and length of the garage and workshop would block out sunlight and overshadow garden and rear windows

Non material planning comments

- Expect significant disruption due to the delivery of construction materials, ground materials, and also significant excavation and demolition.
- Devaluing of property.
- Used for Commercial gain as goods are already seen collected from the property.
- Would this application of extra buildings make a difference to out rateable value
- Cannot understand they want to extend to 5 bedrooms when they could have bought a 5 bedroom house
- Loss of view

Multiple representations have been received from some local residents which have been sent to local Councillors and have been included within the above representations.

Consultation responses to amended drawings

Representations have been received from 14 local residents from 11 addresses. Material planning considerations have been summarised below:

Character/ Design/ Layout

- The whole plan appears to break nearly all the detailed policies in DP3 of the Stretton Local Plan and the design guide.
- Design of extensions and curtilage buildings P119 Policy 7.2 all development should meet the needs of the residents without compromising the ability of future generations to enjoy the same quality of life that the present generation aspire to
- P.36 paragraph 1.3.76 the aim should be to create an extension which is sensitive to and harmonious with the original building. ESBC guidelines state that extensions should be subservient to the original building in terms of its scale and its form, the visual integrity of the building should not be compromised by the extension
- P.47 paragraph 7, extensions should general be a step below the existing ridge and eaves and ridge heights to be consistent with the original building.
- Outside Settlement Boundaries extensions to existing dwellings will only be permitted if they are modest in relation to the original dwelling and retain it's identity. I fail to see how a two bedroom 1930' bungalow being transformed into a modern day 2 floor 5 bedroom dwelling, with significant outbuilding can possibly be in accordance with this provision. Quite clearly, the character of the existing dwelling will be lost, and the ratio of originality and modesty is clearly unacceptable.
- The layout drawing clearly illustrates that the proposal is obviously obtrusive to all adjacent dwellings.
- The spatial pattern is not complied with in consideration of the surrounding dwellings and lawn to brick ratio.
- One would expect a modern day 5 bedroom dwelling to require, or desire, somewhat more garden space.
- The revised plan shows no reduction of the impact of the development will have on the open aspect of this neighbourhood.
- Old part of Stretton so it will be totally out of place but you won't have to wake up to see this blot on the landscape each morning.
- The development is unnecessary
- Cannot see any real difference between the plans
- The original bungalow will become a large house.
- Planning application does not mention any bedrooms or demolition of the existing garage and workshop
- This part of Stretton has an open aspect and particularly from the north elevation will look like an end terrace with what an overbearing brick wall and if allowed will totally alter the open aspect and will be visually intrusive
- Revised plan shows an increase in the footprint of the dwelling even though the conservatory has been removed
- The building is overbearing and out of scale to the size of the plot and has the

potential to be even bigger if they apply for and are granted a conservatory at a later date

- Apart from losing one bedroom on the first floor but increasing the ground floor there has been no reduction of the impact of the extension on the open aspect of this area
- Revised proposal is still overbearing, out of scale and detrimental to the character in terms of its appearance compared with the existing housing along Claymills
- Backdoor to getting the plans passed
- The plans do not realistically represent how much the plot will be intensified by doubling the size of the building and adding a garage and workshop at the rear of the garden,
- The change from a 2 bed roomed bungalow into a multi roomed house and new garage and workshop is still out of character and totally inappropriate for the area.
- Size of the workshop has been slightly reduced however the impact on the surrounding neighbours has not.
- Will adversely impact upon the open aspect of the area and the garage and workshop can still be used for either a dwelling or business
- The proposed Garage and Workshop looks, to resemble an annex to the property. I have never seen a workshop design which incorporates french doors providing a view of the garden.
- The scale of the proposed outbuilding is disproportionate to the main dwelling, estimate the footprint to be approximately 1/3 of the main dwelling.
- Has a large pitched not flat roof.
- Can put a window in the workshop at any time
- Why is it necessary to for a tall long double brick thick double glazed outhouse when there is already a garage and workshop near the existing bungalow
- The whole amended proposal is totally out of character and inappropriate to the local area
- The revised plan of the house, workshop and garage (now renamed as outbuildings) still shows the same huge footprint.
- Little difference between the original and revised plan

Drainage

- The proposed garage will affect the drains of our property during excavations.
- Why would drainage be required in a Garage / Workshop, unless the actual use for something other.
- The trees used to obscure the garage will block light from properties and root growth may also damage drains.

Landscaping

- Putting in trees is this to make it look prettier or more acceptable

Highways

- Concern that by doubling the amount of bedrooms that this could also double the amount of cars coming into and out of the property on an already bad bend and if the garage and workshop are used for business there would be more vehicles coming and going.
- The bungalow has previously had 2 vehicles crash into the front wall on separate occasions
- Anyone can run a business from home and that highways should not be brought into it. I can start for example a taxi business from my home with no problems at all.

Residential Amenities

- Does not indicate how much it will impact on the immediate neighbours and the view from the side. The side view (North elevation) will be a brick wall.
- Still concerned about the garage and workshop although marginally reduced in size will overshadow the garden and consequently indoor living area of No.3 Shrewsbury road.
- No indication of what these will be used for and as such that a stipulation applied that they can never use as a dwelling or business should these plans be passed.
- The plans do not show any reasonable changes to prevent the loss of daylight sunlight or privacy and quiet enjoyment in my own or neighbours gardens
- The proposal would result in loss of light through both our Kitchen and Landing windows, which I consider to be "principal". I would also suggest that the definition of

	<p>“principal” is somewhat subjective.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would be unacceptably overbearing in respect of the impact upon the neighbouring property No.18. <p>Non material planning comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not received an email or post notification of the revised plans • Plenty of four and five bedroom properties for sale in Stretton and the surrounding area. • Can't understand why the person concerned bought a bungalow knowing that it was not fit for his purpose • Did not receive a notice of the original application despite my bungalow and garden abutting the rear boundary of No.16 Claymills road saw the site notice near the post box. <p>Multiple representations have been received from some local residents which have been sent to local Councillors and have been included within the above representations.</p>
Parish Council	<p>Stretton Parish Council would like to register an objection to the above application.</p> <p>The application to extend a bungalow and replace with an extremely large house would be detrimental to the visual amenity and character of the area by reason of siting, contrary to the aims and objectives of Planning Policy Statements.</p> <p>The proposed development is not in keeping with its direct neighbours which are bungalows and semi-detached dwellings. There are light issues identified by the residents of 18 Claymills Road with the proposed height of the development.</p> <p>Neighbours have also advised of concerns regarding the future of the garage/workshop and fear that it could be used for running a business or alternatively turned into a dwelling in the future.</p> <p>Stretton Parish Council hope that the above is taken into consideration when assessing this application and making a decision.</p> <p><u>Consultation response to amended drawing:</u></p> <p>None received at the time of writing this report.</p>
Human Rights Act Considerations	<p>There may be implications under Article 8 and Article 1 of the First Protocol regarding the right of respect for a person's private and family life and home, and to the peaceful enjoyment of possessions. However, these potential issues are in this case amply covered by consideration of the environmental impact of the application under the policies of the development plan and other relevant policy guidance.</p>
Crime and Disorder Implications	<p>It is considered that the proposal does not raise any crime and disorder implications.</p>
Equalities Act 2010	<p>Due regard, where relevant, has been taken to the East Staffordshire Borough Council's equality duty as contained within the Equalities Act 2010.</p>
Planning Officer's Assessment	<p><u>Site Description</u></p> <p>The application site consists of a detached bungalow located on the western side of Claymills Road in the Parish and Ward of Stretton. The area is residential in character and consists of a mixture of detached and semi-detached 1930's style dwellings with a later housing development along Shrewsbury Road to the side and rear. Shrewsbury Road consists of a mix of housing types with a bungalow and dormer bungalow to the rear boundary of No.16.</p> <p>The dwelling benefits from a long plot situated close to the corner of Shrewsbury Road. The bungalow currently has two bedrooms and with a later addition of conservatory to the rear. The dwelling currently has parking for at least two vehicles within the foreground of the</p>

dwelling and has a driveway to the south of the dwelling alongside the side elevation leading to a detached garage and outbuilding within the rear garden.

Proposals

The application seeks consent for the erection of a single storey rear and side extension, alterations to the roof to facilitate a loft conversion including a rear facing dormer, installation of two dormer windows to the front roof slope and the erection of a detached garage and workshop within the rear garden.

During the course of the application negotiations have taken place to address initial concerns and representations received in objection. The proposal has been amended several times with the submission of amended drawings to reduce the scale and impact of the proposal and the detached garage/ workshop prior to further consultations. A canopy above the front door to the principle elevation is also proposed.

The following differences between the originally submitted drawings and the current amended proposal are as follows:

- The garage/ workshop has been approximately reduced in width by 1.6m to 9.2m and reduced in overall height by 0.4m to 3.4m.
- The single storey rear extension has had the conservatory removed and has been reduced in length by approximately 1.84m to 7.97m.
- The single storey rear extensions roof design has been simplified to a pitched roof with a section of flat roof in the centre.
- The side projection of the single storey rear extension has been reduced by approximately 0.395m away from the boundary to project 0.64m from the original side elevation of the dwelling.
- The first floor rear facing dormer has been reduced by approximately 2m in depth and now sits within the original footprint of the dwelling
- The internal layout of the dwelling has been amended due to the reduction in size and the number of bedrooms proposed has been reduced by one to four bedrooms.
- The number of first floor rear facing principle windows has been reduced from two to one due to the amended internal layout.

The proposal includes facing brickwork and plain clay tiles to match the existing dwelling.

OFFICER ASSESSMENT

The main considerations are the impacts on visual and residential amenities and highway safety.

Principle of the Development

The NPPF states that at the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking. Paragraph 11 of the NPPF states that for decision-taking this means:

- approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or
- where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless:
- the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or
- any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.

Local Plan

East Staffordshire Local Plan Policies SP1 and SP35 aim to ensure development is located on sites with good links to the highway network, development is convenient and safe to walk, cycle and travel by public transport. Developments should not result in vehicles harming residential amenity, causing highway safety issues or harming the character of the open countryside.

Policy SP24 of the East Staffordshire Local Plan states that development proposals must contribute positively to the area in which they are proposed and reinforce character and identify through local distinctiveness. Policy DP1 expands upon this aim with specific reference to the design of new development.

Policy DP1 states that planning permission will normally be granted for development which responds positively to the context of the surrounding area and in itself exhibits a high quality design.

Policy DP3 requires householder extensions to have no materially adverse effects on neighbouring properties through issues including overlooking, loss of light to principal windows or private amenity space or create an overbearing impact. The Local Plan policies are supplemented by the East Staffordshire Design Guide and the NPPF (in paragraph 127) indicated that developments should have due regard to the future amenities of residents. This policy also requires extensions to dwellings which are outside of settlement boundaries to be modest in relation to the existing dwelling and retain its identity.

Stretton Neighbourhood Plan

Stretton NP Policy S4 seeks for new development proposals to demonstrate support and enhance the wildlife value of these features.

Stretton NP Policy S6 seeks wherever feasible development proposals will be expected to incorporate sustainable drainage systems.

Visual Amenities

The existing dwelling sits within a prominent corner plot with a pitched roof, this proposal would amend the roof design to form a dual pitched roof with a single full width flat roofed dormer to the rear with two smaller pitched roof dormers to the front.

The proposal would also replace the existing single storey extension to the rear with a larger single storey mansard roof extension to form a lounge and kitchen. The single storey element would project beyond the existing side (northern) elevation.

The proposal also includes a garage/ workshop sited within the rear garden of the dwelling, near to the rear boundary fence.

The proposal would not increase the height of the existing bungalow but would enlarge the existing roof space to allow for the formation of a first floor. The dormer windows are set below the main ridge height of the bungalow by approximately 0.1m. Whilst it is acknowledged that this is a minimal set down from the ridge height of the existing dwelling, a further set down would reduce the internal height. To form a more pronounced visual break, the height of the dwelling would need to be increased, further increasing the mass of the dwelling within this corner location, therefore in this instance the minimal set down is considered acceptable.

The rear facing dormer has been reduced in scale and would now sit within the footprint of the original dwelling, thereby reducing the massing of the proposal at first floor level.

The proposed extensions would form a significantly larger dwelling than the existing, however the proposal is within a sustainable location within the settlement boundary of Stretton and the retained garden area would be considered reasonable for a four bedroomed dwelling.

The dwelling occupies a prominent corner plot adjoining with a residential garden to No.1 Shrewsbury road between the side (northern boundary) and the highway, Shrewsbury Road. The conversion of internal roof space to form a first floor within bungalows in the locality is not uncommon and, albeit in a different form has been carried out at No.22 and No.21 Claymills with the use of Dormer windows to the rear elevations visible within the streetscene from the corner, also the footprint would be similar in length to No.21.

Although the proposal would form a long rear extension to the dwelling, a visual break would be maintained between No.16 and No.1 Shrewsbury Road and the open garden to No.1 would remain unaffected. The existing build line to the front of the dwelling from the highway would also be retained. Therefore although the dwelling would be enlarged to the rear, the

proposal is not considered to affect the openness of the corner plot or the streetscene. It is noted that the opposite corner of Shrewsbury road has been enclosed by a boundary hedge.

The use of dormer windows to the front elevation of the roof, although similar dormers are not visible within the immediate streetscene these are not uncommon within Stretton, and the pitched roof design would emulate the pitched roofs to the bay windows of the neighbouring semi-detached dwellings.

The proposed garage and workshop has been reduced in height with a reduction in the footprint, given the siting to the rear boundary of the dwelling and the surrounding buildings this would not be readily visible within the streetscene. It is noted that the garage would be sited within a similar location as the garage to No.18 Claymills.

The use of matching materials would aid with the integration of the proposal with the host dwelling and within the streetscene.

Comments have been received about the loss of the character and identity of the existing dwelling in relation to part of Policy DP3 which deals with extensions to dwellings which lie outside of settlement boundaries. However the proposal lies within the Settlement boundary and as such this part of the policy is not relevant to this proposal.

Therefore on balance the proposal is not considered to cause demonstrable harm to the locality and it is considered that the proposed extensions and alterations would integrate satisfactorily with the character of the surrounding area in accordance with Local Plan Policies DP1 and DP3.

Residential Amenities

The immediate neighbour, No.18 has a ground floor side facing principle kitchen window which faces north towards No.16. The neighbouring dwelling also has a first floor landing window to the northern elevation which is not considered to be a principle window as a landing is not a habitable room.

The side facing kitchen window has an existing limited outlook to the north. This proposal would not reduce the separation distance between the existing side elevations of the dwellings, given this and the orientation of the dwellings the reduction in outlook from the proposed first floor alterations and rear extension would not be significant to the amenities of the occupiers of No.18 and would not be sufficient to warrant a refusal of the application on these grounds.

With regards to the extensions to the dwelling in relation to the other neighbouring properties, given the separation distances between the proposed first floor windows and the neighbouring dwellings it is not considered that the proposal would be detrimental to the amenities of those properties by way of loss of light or privacy or by being overbearing.

The garage/ workshop would be sited near to the rear boundary of the dwelling, with the boundary treatments to the sides and rear formed of fencing approximately between 1.8m and 2m in height. The height of fencing to the southern (side) boundary is lower adjacent to the neighbours (No.18) garage to the rear of the garden. The gardens to the dwellings to the rear are significantly smaller than that of No.16 Claymills and the garage would be sited to the east of the rear elevations of these dwellings. Given the siting of the proposal and the reduced scale and height of the garage/ workshop, whilst it is acknowledged that the single storey building would be higher than the existing boundary treatment, given the distance from the neighbouring dwellings the proposal is not considered to adversely impact on the occupiers of those properties by way of loss of light or privacy or by being overbearing. Furthermore a similar building could be constructed without planning permission under permitted development at a height of 2.5m.

Comments have been received about a similar proposal which was refused in 2008, application PA/32196/0032/MB for a detached dwelling within the rear garden of No17 Claymills, however this proposal is for extensions to the existing dwelling and a detached outbuilding within the rear garden of the dwelling. Therefore the previous refusal for a detached dwelling is not considered to be relevant to this proposal.

With regard to the potential of noise and disturbance issues, it is considered that provided the

outbuilding is only used for purposes ancillary to the main use of the property as a dwellinghouse the development is unlikely to have any significant detrimental impacts on surrounding residents. A condition of any grant of approval would require the outbuilding and workshop to be limited to such ancillary use. Furthermore given the location of the garage/workshop the use of the building as living accommodation would be unsuitable and a condition to limit the use of the building to a garage/ workshop would be considered reasonable.

Therefore on balance, subject to appropriate conditions the proposed extensions and garage/workshop are not considered to cause sufficient harm to the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings to warrant a refusal of the proposal on these grounds. Therefore the application complies with Local Plan Policy DP3 and DP7.

Highway Safety

The Council's Parking Standards SPD sets out standards for different uses and different sized dwellings including space size, accessibility and the quantity of car parking spaces required for different uses.

The application site has a large area of hardstanding to the front of the dwelling and a driveway to the south of the dwelling with a garage to the rear. The driveway to the front provides a minimum of two parking spaces which is sufficient for the existing dwelling. This application seeks to extend the existing dwelling to provide two additional bedrooms, which would total four bedrooms. The SPD would expect a four bedroomed dwelling to have a minimum of three parking spaces. The internal space within the garage would meet the size requirements of the SPD. The existing access with the highway would remain unaltered.

The submitted plans demonstrates space for two vehicles to the front of the property and a third space within the proposed garage. This therefore complies with the parking standards set out in the Parking Standards SPD.

The neighbour comments received in relation to parking, visibility and highway safety have been considered, however, the proposed development complies with parking standards and Staffordshire County Council Highways are satisfied that there would be no adverse impact on highway safety subject to a condition to retain the garage for the parking of vehicles and use as a workshop. Whilst the property is on the corner of Claymills Road there is an existing driveway by the side of the property that would remain unaltered.

Comments have been received in relation to the running of a business from home, provided that this would not involve a material change of use of the land then this would generally be considered as permitted development and would not be subject to planning control. This proposal does not include any information in relation to running a business from the dwelling or if the proposed works would for business purposes.

Given residents' concerns with regard to the use of the garage a condition is recommended to restrict the use of the workshop and garage for the parking of motor vehicles and cycles and remain ancillary to the dwelling to protect against the building being used for commercial purposes or being used for living accommodation.

The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Local Plan Policies SP1 and SP35.

Heritage Assets

Paragraph 126 of the NPPF states the Local Planning Authorities should recognise that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance.

In determining planning applications with respect to any building or other land in a conservation area, local planning authorities are under a statutory duty under Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. Section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 provides that in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the secretary of state shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its

setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Case law has established that this means that considerable weight has to be given to that statutory duty when balancing the proposal against other material considerations. Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss.

Strategic Policy 25 states that Development proposals should protect, conserve and enhance heritage assets and their settings, taking into account their significance, as well as the distinctive character of the Borough's townscapes and landscapes.

Detailed Policy 5 goes into more detail regarding Historic Assets, Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and Archaeology. Detailed policy 6 aims to protect other heritage assets which are not necessarily covered by listed building or conservation area status, such as shopfronts and the setting of important historic landscapes.

The nearest Conservation Area is approximately 295 metres away, The Trent and Mersey Conservation Area. Given the distance between the site and the Trent and Mersey Canal, there is no intervisibility, particularly as the A38 is an intervening feature between the site and the conservation area.

The nearest Listed Building is St Marys Church situated in the centre of Stretton on Church Road, this is approximately 692m away. There is no intervisibility between the proposal and this building.

The separation distances with the heritage assets are such that the proposed development will have no impact on the conservation area or any listed buildings or their setting and Sections 66 (1) and Section 72 are therefore not engaged.

Flood Risk

Section 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework seeks to ensure that new development is not at risk from flooding, or does not increase flood risk elsewhere. It advocates the use of a sequential test with the aim of steering new developments to areas with the lowest probability of flooding. The Environment Agency produces flood risk maps which classifies land according to probability of flooding. The areas of highest risk are classified as Flood Zone 3, with a 1 in 100 or greater annual probability of flooding, and the areas of lowest risk are classified as Flood Zone 1, with a less than 1 in 1000 annual probability of flooding.

Strategic Policy 27 expects all new development to incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS).

The site lies entirely within Flood Zone 1 and as such is at a low risk from fluvial flooding. There is no requirement to submit a flood risk assessment. Therefore the application complies with the provision of local Plan Policy SP27.

Stretton NP policy S6 seeks wherever feasible development proposals will be expected to incorporate sustainable drainage systems. The application will use the existing drainage of the existing property and therefore is not required to submit any further drainage details.

Biodiversity

Paragraph 175 within Section 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, planning permission should be refused.

The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 states that public authorities in England have a duty to have regard to conserving biodiversity as part of policy or decision making.

Strategic Policy 29 lists criteria including development to retain features of biological interest which produces a net gain in biodiversity, in line with Staffordshire biodiversity action plan

species and supporting developments with multi-functional benefit.

Stretton Neighbourhood Plan Policy S4 seeks for new development proposals to demonstrate support and enhance the wildlife value of these features.

Trees/shrubs within the site are, in the most part, to be retained and as such the local habitat will remain fairly constant. The application is for householder development rather than an application for full planning permission and as such ecology surveys are not required. An informative is recommended to ensure that the applicant is aware of his responsibilities should protected species be discovered when the existing garage is demolished. This is considered to comply with Local Plan Policy SP29

Other Considerations

The Environmental Health team have commented that the dwelling is sited within an area that is affected by radon gas and have requested that the applicant's attention is brought to this. An informative can be attached to any grant of permission to make the applicant aware of this.

Comments have been received in relation to existing and proposed drainage, however this is dealt with under separate Building Control legislation.

Neighbour comments have been received in relation to the disruption during construction works, however this is dealt with under separate Environmental Health Legislation.

The site lies within an area which was a former Iron Age settlement and as such SCC Archaeology have been consulted and have declined to comment unless due to advice being given on a cost recovery basis.

Conclusion

The proposed extensions as amended, although within a prominent corner location is not considered to cause demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the locality to warrant a refusal on these grounds and is therefore considered to be in accordance with the policies of the local plan, Stretton neighbourhood plan and the Design guidance.

The proposed extensions and alterations given the orientation and relationship are a sufficient distance away from the occupiers of neighbouring properties to not have a sufficiently detrimental impact on the amenity of the occupiers to warrant a refusal of the proposal. In addition to this the proposed detached garage/ workshop, subject to conditions is not considered to cause demonstrable harm to the amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwellings.

The highways impact of the scheme has been assessed by SCC Highway Authority and no objections have been raised in relation to the proposal, subject to conditions.

There are no issues in relation to flooding or biodiversity as part of the scheme.

The proposed development is not within a conservation area and given the separation distances, it is not considered that the proposal would have an impact on views into, or those out of, the nearest conservation area, nor is any listed building or its setting affected. The statutory duties under Sections 66 (1) and 72 are therefore not engaged.

The application proposal is considered acceptable and appropriate within an existing residential curtilage in a residential area. The amended design is considered acceptable within the context of the area. The application is acceptable in principle and of an appropriate design and is therefore in accordance with Policies SP1, SP24, SP35, DP1, DP3 and DP7 of the Local Plan and Policies of the Stretton Neighbourhood Plan.

Planning Officer's response to Parish Council and Neighbour's Comments	<p>It is considered that the above Officer Assessment responds to the comments of the Parish Council and neighbours.</p> <p>Comments have also been received in relation to some neighbour letters not being received, however letters have been sent to these address points.</p> <p>Comments have been received in relation to the planting of trees, however these are existing within the front garden of the neighbouring dwelling and do not form part of any proposed landscaping.</p> <p>Comments received in relation to the devaluation of property, use for commercial gain, alterations to the rateable value, loss of view and the reasons why they want to extend to a larger home are not material planning considerations.</p>
RECOMMENDATION	<p>Accordingly, taking into consideration the above mentioned planning considerations the recommendation is to PERMIT the proposal, subject to the following conditions:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Time limit condition (3 years) (0000001a) 2. Compliance with the approved plans (00002) 3. Matching materials (00002G) 4. Garage shall be retained for the parking of motor vehicles and cycles. (00004d) 5. The garage and workshop shall remain ancillary to the dwelling known as 16 Claymills and shall not be converted into living accommodation without the prior approval of the Local Planning Authority. (00015b) 6. Prior to the garage/ workshop being brought into use the existing garage and outbuilding shall be removed (bespoke) 7. Removal of PD rights for extensions and curtilage buildings (00012a) <p>The following informative's should also be included with the above recommendation;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Engagement Informative 2. Ecology Informative 3. Radon Gas Informative
Engagement	<p>During the course of consideration of this proposal the Local Planning Authority has negotiated with the applicant to ensure the development complies with relevant development plan policies and material planning considerations including the National Planning Policy Framework. It is therefore considered that the Local Planning Authority has worked proactively with the applicant to secure a development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area in accordance with the requirements of Paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>
Section 106 Required?	<p style="text-align: center;">No</p>
Background Papers	<p>The following papers were used in the preparation of this report:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local and National Planning policies outlined above in the report. • All papers and drawings on the planning application file reference P/2018/01594