DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2020/0096 **Valid 24/03/2020**	**228 DRAYCOTT OLD ROAD** **DRAYCOTT**	**PROPOSED SIDE EXTENSION WITH DORMER WINDOWS AND LOFT CONVERSION TO MAIN DWELLING** **(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)**

MAIN ISSUES
Impact on the Green Belt, character and appearance of the streetscene, the amenity of neighbours and highway safety.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE
A 250m stretch of Draycott Old Road serves a linear row of modest semi detached bungalows that all have front elevations and roof lines running parallel to the road. All of the dwellings are in the Green Belt and on the opposite side of the road to the north there is a mature hedge line with open fields beyond.

The applicant's bungalow is at the end of this row and there is a wider 8 metre gap between its side elevation and the curtilage boundary than there is to the side of any of the other bungalows. The adjoining bungalow has a dormer roof extension to the front and rear and there are at least two other bungalows further along the row that have similar roof extensions.

The applicant's bungalow has one driveway parking space and a sectional garage.

PROPOSAL
To add a side extension and three roof dormer additions. The side extension would have a full pitch roof, its frontage would be set back and recessive meaning that the ridge line would run through at a subordinate level to that of the main house.

Additionally to that, there would be a box dormer extension added to the front and rear of the main roof, they would match the size and dimension those of the neighbour, and a small third dormer would be added to the rear roof slope of the side extension.

This is a resubmitted revised application. The width of the side extension has been reduced considerably to be just half the width of the original and a second large front facing dormer has been deleted from the front roof slope of the side extension.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES
Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Adopted 2014)
S01 Spatial Objectives
SS1 Development Principles
SS1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
SS6c Other Rural Area

DC1 Design Considerations
T1 Development and Sustainable Transport

Emerging Local Plan
Paragraph 48 of the newly adopted NPPF states that:
"decision-takers may also give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:
- the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced the preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);
- the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and
- the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in this Framework (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).
In this context, the Council's position on the weight to be given to the policies contained in the Local Plan Submission Version in terms of the three criteria set out in Paragraph 48 of the NPPF is as follows:
- The stage of preparation – the Local Plan is now at an advanced stage of preparation as the Council has submitted it to the SoS for examination
- The extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies – this varies depending on the policy in question. The Officer Comments section of this report identifies the level of outstanding objections to each policy and recommends the amount of weight to be given to them at this stage in the process
- The degree of consistency of policies with the NPPF – given that the Council has submitted a Local Plan that it considers to be sound, all policies are deemed to be consistent with the NPPF.

The emerging policies relevant to this application are as follows:
SS10 Other Rural Areas
DC1 Design

National Planning Policy Framework
Section(s) 2 Achieving Sustainable Development, 4 Decision Making, 12 Achieving well designed places, 13 Green Belt

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS
SMD/2019/00485 Side Extension and dormer additions. Refused (Disproportionate addition, inappropriate development in Green Belt)

CONSULTATIONS
Publicity
Site Notice expiry date: 1st May 2020
Neighbour consultation period ends: 1st May 2020
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments
None
Town / Parish Comments

Draycott Parish Council: Awaited

SCC Minerals
No comments to make.
Severn Trent Water
No objection.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Impact on the Green Belt
The property is in the Green Belt where development is inappropriate and, by definition, harmful unless it is provided for by one of the closed list of exceptions at paragraph 145 of the NPPF. One of these exceptions relevant to the consideration of this proposal is the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.

The side extension proposed with this resubmitted and revised application would increase the footprint of the original bungalow by almost 40% (the earlier proposal would have resulted in 60% increase). The width of the side extension's front elevation would be no more than half that of the original bungalow – a side addition dimensioned accordingly would be permitted by the GPDO provided it does not exceed 4metres in height. With merits of good design the side extension would have a full pitch roof that would take its height over 4m but in doing so, set back from the front, its height and mass is limited with a ridge line that runs in at a subordinate level and sits within the gable of the original. Overall, the extension that adds just 40% to the footprint of the original building, has width proportions that do not exceed half that of the original, and keeps its height and mass to a level that is subordinate to that of the original would not in this case be considered a disproportionate addition.

Volumetrically, the three dormers would add further to the size of the original dwelling, however, they do not add to its footprint or the extent to which it expands into the surrounding undeveloped land. Each dormer would sit centrally and modestly within its corresponding roof slope without overwhelming the form and size of the building with excessive mass or bulk.

Considered as one, the development would not be a disproportionate addition to the original dwelling. In terms of their size and proportion the additions would be very much subordinate to the form and size of the original dwelling. The development would be provided for by the exception at para 145 of the NPPF and would not be inappropriate and harmful to the Green Belt.

Design and Impact on Character and Appearance.
The single dormer extension on the front facing roof slope that matches that of the neighbour's in terms of design, size and positioning would be readily absorbed within the street scene. Indeed it would create a certain balance and visual parity across the front elevations of the two semis and there are other examples, further along, where this has been achieved. This revised submission has deleted the addition of a second dormer from the front roof slope of the side extension that would have created roof mass and bulk that would dominate the bungalow making it very top heavy, instead the proportions of the side extension have been much reduced to a

width that is less that of the original dwelling. Incidentally, a less complimentary design of similarly sized side extension could be built without planning permission if, with a roof that is flat or had a shallower pitch, the maximum height were kept at 4metres. The front of the side extension is set back and recessive and accordingly its ridge height is subordinate to that of the main dwelling. The two dormer additions on the rear roof slopes would be effectively concealed from view, enclosed within the garden area by surrounding property they would not have impact on the local distinctiveness of the street scene or area. Overall the development would be compliant with the other rural area strategy SS6c and design policies DC1 and R2 of the CS.

Amenity
The proposed extensions would not interfere with outlook from any of the neighbour's windows or project beyond any of their windows. There would be no windows in the side elevation of the extension and the front faces open field. The rear facing roof dormer windows would be a total of 40m from the rear of the dwelling to the rear.

Highway Safety
The floor plans show that there would be three bedrooms and the layout arranges the space accordingly and appropriately to the space available. Parking standards in the emerging submission version of the Local Plan require the provision of 2 off road spaces for a dwelling with this number of bedrooms. The side extension would not consume any of the existing parking space which provides room for two cars at the front.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE
The development would not be inappropriate and harmful to the Green Belt. It would represent good design that would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area or to neighbouring amenity. Overall the proposal is for sustainable development that would conflict with the Development Plan or the NPPF.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : APPROVE

Case Officer: Ben Hurst
Recommendation Date: 19/05/2020

X B.J. Haywood

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council