

Date 29 March 2021
Our Reference CCOP1/MAS906/2
Your Reference
Please ask for Carl Copestake
Direct Dial 01782 349539
Facsimile 01782 712522
Email carl.copestake@knightsplc.com



Lisa Jackson
Staffordshire Moorlands District Council
Moorlands House
Stockwell Street
Leek
ST13 6HQ

BY EMAIL

Dear Lisa

**Proposed Single Storey Rear Extension
Resubmission of SMD/2020/0075
48 Ash Bank Road, Werrington**

Following the refusal of planning application SMD/2020/0075 and its subsequent dismissal at appeal by the Planning Inspectorate (APP/B3438/D/20/3254011), Knights have been instructed to resubmit a planning application proposing a reduced scheme that would reduce the length of the extension to 4.8 metres.

The following plans are submitted to support this planning application:

- Location Plan and Block Plan - drawing number 2426/19/01C
- Existing Plans and Elevations - drawing number 2426/19/02
- Proposed Plans and Elevations - drawing number 2426/19/03F
- Proposed Details 2 - drawing number 2426/19/04E

The proposed extension would retain its step in in order to ensure that the eaves height would sit below the original eaves of the rear gable (as previously proposed under the prior approval application HNT/2020/0028) in order to respond to the LPA's previous concerns about the awkward design relationship between the two elements. This would also ensure that the extension retains a degree of subservience to the original building. The extension would be rendered to match the existing building.

The extension would remove the utility element and would provide a single open plan kitchen / diner / lounge area, albeit covering a smaller area. Indeed the proposed extension would not extend out further than the existing extension that is located on the eastern side of the rear elevation.

The previous extension that was refused under SMD/2020/0075 extended out 8 metres when measured from the gable on the western portion of the rear elevation and 9.4 metres when measured from the eastern section of the rear elevation. The extension now proposed would extend out only 4.8 metres when measured from the western portion of the rear elevation (and 6.2 metres when measured from the eastern section).

Knights plc
The Brampton
Newcastle-under-Lyme
Staffordshire
ST5 0QW

T 01782 619225
W knightsplc.com

When considering the appeal for that planning application, the Inspector concluded that, whilst the extension that was would reduce openness, when viewed in isolation this would be minimal (paragraph 8), the proposal would not be prominent or obvious when viewed from Ash Bank Road and visual impact from Green's Lane would be limited (paragraph 9), the extension would be long in relation to the existing house but this would not be apparent when viewed from any public viewpoints or from neighbours (paragraph 10), the low height of the roof would help to limit the overall scale of the extension and would retain the dominance of the original building; resulting in an acceptable visual effect (paragraph 10), that the development would not cause undue harm to the character and appearance of the area and the impact on openness of the Green Belt would be neutral (paragraph 12).

The Inspector concluded that the extension would be acceptable in design but would result in a disproportionate addition (hence dismissing the appeal).

It is evident that, whilst the Inspector considered the scheme to be an inappropriate development, the proposal did not result in an impact on openness, and therefore the decision was a marginal one.

Our revised proposal would reduce the extension from 8.5 metres to 4.8 metres (taken from the rear gable). When considering the limited impact that the Inspector considered would have on the Green Belt, the site's location within a continuous built up frontage and the substantial extensions that have previously been approved at no.46 that this revised scheme should be acceptable, particularly as the extension would not extend any further back than the existing extension (which would be demolished as a result).

The proposed development would therefore comprise an appropriate form of development in the Green Belt (by way of it not resulting in a disproportionate extension to the original dwelling), in accordance with paragraph 145 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The proposal would therefore accord with the Development Plan, and as such, in accordance with Section 38(6) of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, planning permission ought to be granted.

Yours sincerely

CARL COPESTAKE