

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2021/0392
Valid 29/06/2021

281 EAVES LANE
ARMSHEAD

**SINGLE STOREY REAR
EXTENSION TO FORM
SITTING ROOM, SHOWER &
UTILITY ROOM.**

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

Impact on the Green Belt, character and appearance of the area and the amenity of the area.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

Semi detached white rendered cottage. Drive slopes up from the roadside to an elevated property. The cottage is one in a little row of four that appear on Eaves Lane, a country road that winds through open Green Belt between settlements. Road runs between traditional hedgerow, occasional mature trees, and stones walls. Open farm land beyond the roadside and to the rear of the cottage.

PROPOSAL

A ground floor extension would project 5metres from the full width of the rear elevation – this would replace an existing long thin flat roof extension that projects from rear elevation and has its rear wall built along the shared boundary with the adjoining neighbour. An existing integral garage in the 80s side extension would be converted into a lounge space and an up and over door replaced with a window that matches the adjacent frame. The rear extension would have a flat roof with a central glazed roof lantern.

This proposal would be an alternative to planning permission SMD/2019/0535 that has already been granted for a similarly sized rear addition that would have had a very shallow sloping lean to tiled roof and development that would have included a first floor addition that would have increased the run of the main ridge line. This alternative proposal does not include the first floor addition.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Local Plan Development Plan Document (Adopted 2020)

S01 Spatial Objectives
SS1 Development Principles
SS10 Other Rural Area
DC1 Design Considerations
T1 Development and Sustainable Transport

National Planning Policy Framework

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

84/13465/OLDDC Side extension. Approved and implemented.

SMD/2019/0535 two storey and single storey rear extensions. Approved, not implemented.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 23.08.2021

Neighbour consultation period ends: 23.08.2021

Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

None

Town / Parish Comments

Awaited

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The property is in the Green Belt where development is, by definition harmful, unless it is provided for by one of the exceptions on the closed list at paragraph 145 of the NPPF. One of those exceptions 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.

In this case the original building is a small 19th Century semi detached cottage. It has already been disproportionately extended in the 1980s with footprint additions that have added more than 100%. Overall this proposal would add significantly to those additions which are already over and above that of the original. The proposal would result in further disproportionate extension and the exception would not provide for the development.

The single storey rear extension that is proposed with this application would essentially have the same massing and footprint as a rear extension that was granted a planning permission in 2019. However, overall the additions now proposed would be smaller because they would not include the mass of a first floor addition, which the applicant now describes as not needed and prohibitably expensive. The officer analysis set out below, was applied in the case of the 2019 application and still stands as relevant and appropriate in respect of this amended and reduced proposal.

The development would be inappropriate and planning permission should not be granted unless there are very special circumstances that clearly outweigh the substantial weight that should be attributed to the Green Belt harm.

In this case there is already an existing flat roof single storey extension (23sq m) that would be demolished to make way for a 7metre by 5metre (35sq m) uniformly rectangular extension. If the flat roof extension were retained and extended using the provisions of the GPDO it could be extended to the side, without planning permission, with an addition that did not extend beyond the original rear wall by more than 6metres. That would result in another 12 sq. metres being added and a total extension footprint (a combination of existing long narrow extension and additions that could be made as permitted development) that equalled that of the proposal but would not have the same uniform shape.

A 35sq metre rear extension would only be permitted if the applicant were to rely on the HNT process. However, the rear elevation of the existing extension already runs the whole of the boundary and, while it seems unlikely, even if the neighbour were to object, it would not harm his amenity. While it would not be as neatly arranged, the permitted extension would provide meaningful space and shape that would make it worthwhile, and therefore as a 'fall back' there is reasonable prospect of the permitted development being carried out if planning permission were refused for the current proposal.

Both forms of development (permitted and proposed) would be equally harmful to the Green Belt, however, the proposed extension would have a neater and more natural arrangement of shape and space provided within one coherent structure that provides essentially a reconfiguration of what could be the combined footprint of existing rear extension and that which would be permitted. As such, the additional merit found in the design and appearance is enough to favour the grant of planning permission as an alternative to the GPDO provisions.

Impact on Character and appearance

From the front the existing side extension runs through with a front elevation that is flush with that of the original, there is no visual break or set back. However the extension's ridge has a slightly dropped position below that of the main roof, this is because the side extension does not run the full width of the side elevation and its rear elevation does not line up with that of the original. This amended proposal omits a scheme to extend at first floor in a way that would match up the ridge line, and there is design benefit in those regards.

From the rear a rather long ugly flat roof extension, already demolished with permission to replace it with the development approved in 2019, would be replaced with a neat rectangular coherent structure with a flat roof and roof lantern that would only flank part of the boundary and open the garden to some degree. This proposal amends the already approved scheme swapping what might have appeared as a very awkward and wide shallow tiled mono pitched roof, that would have been difficult to build, with a flat roof and glazed roof lantern. The change in roof design would impose no additional harm to the character and appearance of the area,

particularly as it would be largely concealed from view, and would be acceptable as an alternative approach.

There would be no harm to the character and appearance of the area. The development would not be visible from the front as it would be concealed behind the dwelling.

Amenity

The dwelling is semi-detached. A pre-existing flat roof addition had a rear elevation that extended the entire 10metre length of the shared boundary flanking the neighbour's garden and limiting their ground floor outlook. That pre-existing extension has since demolished, with the existing permission in place, a substantial brick boundary wall has been left in place imposing a similar affect on the neighbour's outlook as the rear wall of the extension.

The proposal would extend and flank the boundary by just 5 metres which they might consider to be an improvement on the existing situation. There has been no objection from neighbours.

Highway Safety

The proposal plans do not indicate the provision of additional bedrooms. Supplementary or improved parking provision is not required. The integral garage would be lost from the property but given the gradient of the drive it would appear to have been rather impractical in any event. Appears as though three cars could park on the drive to the front and side.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The harm to the Green Belt would be equal to that of a legitimate GPDO 'fall back'. However, a more coherent design approach favours the grant of permission for the application proposal.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : APPROVE

Case Officer: Ben Hurst

Recommendation Date: 8th October 2021

X 

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council