

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2021/0343
Valid 20/05/2021

MEADOWCROFT COMMON
LANE
DILHORNE

FIRST FLOOR SIDE
EXTENSION

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Impact to Green Belt
- Design and visual impact
- Neighbouring amenity
- Highway safety

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

It is located at the end of a row of dwellinghouses that fronts 'The Common' in Dilhorne which is a small hamlet within the Green Belt.

The application site comprises an enlarged detached two-storey dwellinghouse constructed of render, brick and grey tiled gable roof. It features an elongated veranda that runs the width of the property and is incorporated with the integral side garage. To front, there are two entrances that leads onto driveway that can accommodate 3 cars off-road and landscaped front garden. To the rear, the site offers a large garden that is partially screened by mature hedging and trees. The property has previously extended, this includes the side integral garage, part two storey and part single storey rear extension together with garden store.

PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a two storey side extension above the existing integral garage in order to create an additional bedroom; The extension will have the same footprint as the garage. It will have the same width (3m) as the garage to the front however, widens to 5.2m to the rear to connect the extension with the existing two storey rear extension. It will have an eaves height of 2.7m and ridge height of 3.6m.

It will use matching materials used on the existing dwelling.

RELEVANT INFORMATION

In the original scheme, the front elevation of the single storey side extension was flush with principal elevation and ridge height was in line with the original roof line. The amended proposal seeks a reduction in roof ridge and is set back from the front elevation of the host dwelling. The re-amended plan is the final plan which is to be assessed.

The existing and proposed rear elevation shown on the plans does not reflect the appearance of the dwelling seen on site. Whilst the rear gable has not been included in the scheme, the proposed description as set out in the application site does not

relate to the removal of this gable and will not affect this part of the dwelling. This element will not be considered.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Staffs Moorlands Local Plan (adopted September 2020)

SS2 Settlement Hierarchy

SS10 Other rural areas

DC1 Design Considerations

T1 Development and Sustainable Transport

National Planning Policy Framework

Section 13: Protecting Green belt land

SITE HISTORY

SMD/1991/0157	Extension to form utility room W.C Store and garden store	08-10-91 Approved
SMD/1982/0089	Retention of vehicular access	20/08/1982 Approved
SMD/1978/0215	Extension to form kitchen, dining room, bathroom and garage	23/02/1978 Approved

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 08/06/21

Neighbour consultation period ends: 23/06/21

Press Advert: N/A

OFFICER COMMENTS

Impact to the Green Belt

The application site is located in the Green Belt. Policy SS2 and SS9 of the Local Plan (2020) and, chapter 13 of the NPPF (2019) are applicable.

The proposal is for the erection of a two storey side extension above the integral garage. Chapter 13, paragraph 145 criterion C in the NPPF outlines that the construction of new buildings should be regarded as inappropriate in the Green Belt unless it meets an exception. One such exception is (c) 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.

Policy SS2 of the Local Plan states that the location and scale of development must comply with the settlement hierarchy to ensure that the most sustainable locations are considered ahead of those further down the hierarchy and states that new development in Green Belt locations as noted under 'Smaller villages area strategy' will be resisted, unless if permitted by national policy on Green Belts.

Policy SS9: Smaller Villages Area Strategy further adds that development on a large scale are to be resisted as these villages generally have a poor range of services and facilities and it is often necessary for local residents to travel outside the village for most of their daily needs. The policy is clear in its spatial strategy to ensure that the character and life of the settlement is not undermined. Limited development, including infill will be supported subject to this policy and Green Belt Policy set out in the NPPF.

Neither the Local Plan nor the NPPF (2019) provide a definition of what is regarded as being 'disproportionate' for the purposes of Green Belt policy however, previous policy guidance considered a development resulting in a 30% increase in the size of the original building as being acceptable.

The agent provided cumulative volume calculations of both the original dwelling and the existing dwelling together with the proposed extension; This is the calculations:

Volume of **original** building = 330 cub.m

Volume of **built extensions** = 380 cub.m

Volume of **proposed extension** = 105 cub.m

The existing extensions have increased the original floorspace by 115.2%. The proposed extension would increase the original floorspace by an additional 31.8%. The cumulative volume increase over the original dwelling is therefore, 147%.

On a visual context, the council is of the opinion that the sections highlighted are/ will be additions to the original dwelling:



In further context, this is the rear of the property.



From this, the volume increase demonstrates that when the additional footprint which would be created by the proposed extension is added to the extensions which have already been built, the cumulative total would exceed more than double the original dwelling to be considered as modest and proportionate. The proposed extension alone, without previous additions, would equate to 31.8% to the original volume. This is also evident by the workings on the plan and the added bulk to the rear of the property over the years which is visible from the site photo. Therefore, the extension will result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.

The agent has stated that the property has been subject to previous extensions however, and notes that the location of the dwelling in a group of houses within a village constitutes site specific circumstances that form the very special circumstances necessary to permit the development.

Whilst the case officer recognises, in the literal sense, that the site sits at the edge of a row of four houses, these houses are evenly and generously spaced from each other with the small exception of the applicant's garage. Nevertheless, the garage is single storey and does not have the same presence than the proposed two storey element which on balance, counteracts the openness and permeance that National Green Belt Policy is aiming to achieve. Therefore, no very special circumstances are given.

It should also be noted that Dilhorne has no defined village boundary but rather by virtue of the alignment of the Green Belt boundary as noted in Policy SS9. Therefore, the Green Belt policy must take precedence as the NPPF is clear in its guidance that inappropriate development is based on its additions over and above the size of the original building; in this instance, the Council considers 147% to be disproportionate to the original dwelling.

Thus, the proposal would be contrary to Policy SS2 and Policy SS9 and, Paragraph 145c on Green Belt Policy.

Design and visual impact

Policy DC1 refers to design and seeks to secure development of a high quality which is designed to add value to the area and to respect the site and its surroundings. New development should promote a positive sense of place and identity through its scale, density, layout, siting, landscaping, character and appearance.

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 the original building and be subordinate to it in terms of its size and massing.

Referring to only the design and appearance of the extension, it will be in keeping with existing dwelling as it will match existing fenestrations and match materials used on dwelling. Therefore, the scheme accords with DC1 in design terms.

Referring to the scale and mass, the proposed extension would sit subservient and sympathetic with the overall appearance of the dwelling as the front elevation is setback from the first floor and set down from the original roof ridge so not to appear overly prominent.

Whilst it is recognised that the proposed extension will sit visually higher than the adjacent neighbour which is characteristically a bungalow, on balance, the street-scene is mix in character and would not appear overbearing with the bungalow to warrant for a refusal on these grounds.

This application is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policy DC1 of the Local plan.

Neighbouring amenity

Paragraph 127(f) of the NPPF (2019) and policy DC1 seeks to secure development that protects amenity, including residential amenity, in terms of satisfactory daylight, sunlight, outlook, privacy and soft landscaping.

The main neighbouring properties that this proposal would impact upon are the neighbouring properties at: Winsford (to the east) and Manderley (to the rear).

Winsford is an elongated bungalow. It has no side facing windows and several windows to the rear, the nearest window serves a bedroom. It is considered that the two storey side extension will have no greater impact than the integral garage that currently runs along the side the neighbour's boundary. The side extension does not breach the neighbour's 45 degree guideline and marginally projects 2m from the rear elevation; The nearest window serving a bedroom is currently screened by its own mature hedging. On balance, the impact of the extension would not be detrimental to the neighbour at Winsford.

Manderley sits to the far end of the applicant's garden. Notwithstanding the protruding single storey rear extension, there is a separation distance of approx. 30m from elevation to elevation. Therefore, the neighbour's amenity is maintained.

It is for these reasons that the proposed development will comply with policy DC1 of the Local Plan (2020) and the NPPF (2019).

Highway Safety

Section 9 of the NPPF states that developments should achieve safe and suitable access to the site for all users. Policy T1 of the Local Plan states that permission will only be granted for development incorporating adequate and satisfactory parking provisions.

For a dwelling consisting of four bedroom units (including the annex on the lower floor), a minimum of three parking spaces are recommended. The proposal would not affect the three existing parking provisions on the driveway and would replace the integral garage. Thus, three parking spaces are available following the proposal.

This application is therefore considered to be in accordance with Section 9 of the NPPF and Policy T1 of the Local Plan.

Other matters

Severn Trent Waters were consulted. No response was received.

CONCLUSION

The proposal would result in a disproportionate addition to the original house to create a cumulative volume of 147%. As such the proposal represents inappropriate development within the greenbelt and would compromise the openness of the greenbelt contrary to the provisions of National Planning Policy and policies SS2 and SS9 of the Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : Refuse

Case Officer: Lisa Li

Recommendation Date: 15/07/21

X 

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council