

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2021/0712
Valid 10/11/2021

BRENTWOOD
CAVERSWALL COMMON
LANE
CAVERSWALL

PROPOSED SIDE AND REAR
EXTENSION TO EXISTING
DWELLING

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

Whether not the proposal amounts to inappropriate development in the Green Belt
The impact on the character and appearance of the area
The impact on residential amenity.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The site lies in the countryside to the north of Caverswall in an area known as Caverswall Common. It is in the Green Belt. It comprises a brick and tile bungalow (with rooms in the roofspace) with the entrance door at the side. It is on the south side of Caverswall Common Road which provides the access to the site and there are two large adjacent dwellings in spacious plots to the east side. To the rear (south), west side and to the north, there is open land and there is former garden centre/plant nursery site to the north-west on the opposite side of the road where there is also a dwelling. The land slopes downwards towards the west.

PROPOSAL

This is a full householder planning application for a rear extension, providing accommodation on two floors and also a first-floor rear dormer and side porch. The rear extension and porch would have a white render finish in contrast to the red brick finish of the house. The rear extension would have higher eaves than the dwelling and a pitched roof which would be no higher than the existing main roof of the house. The roof would contain a proposed new first-floor bedroom.

The plans have been amended to reduce the size and projection of the rear extension and also remove a previous proposed small single-storey rear extension from the scheme.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Staffs Moorlands Local Plan (adopted September 2020)

SS10 Other Rural Areas Strategy
DC1 – Design Considerations

NPPF (Revised July 2021)

Sections 12 (Design) and 13 (Green Belts).

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

SMD/1978/0249: Side extension to form dining room, utility room, store on the ground floor and bedroom above in the roofspace. Approved.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 4/1/22.

Neighbour consultation period ends: 4/1/22.

Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

None.

Town / Parish Comments

None.

OFFICER COMMENTS

The site is in the Green Belt and Policy SS10, the strategy for the countryside, requires strict control over inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Paras 149 and 150 of the NPPF list the forms of development that are deemed exceptionally to not be inappropriate and therefore by definition, not harmful to the openness of the Green Belt. The enlargement of buildings is listed but providing that this would not amount to a disproportionate enlargement in relation to the original building i.e. as it stood when first built before any previous enlargements.

It is noted that there has been a significant side extension of equal height to the dwelling already, built under a 1978 planning permission. Any further extension must therefore be viewed with the existing extension when determining if the total enlargement is disproportionate in relation to the original dwelling. A conservatory was added to the rear wall of the extension, presumably under permitted development, but this is proposed to be replaced by the rear extension and therefore does not need to be considered. There are no other previous extensions to the dwelling and the rear living room projection appears to be part of the original house (it is shown as being existing on the 1978 plans).

The original plans included a larger rear extension and a separate smaller single-storey extension. After initial calculations were undertaken, the total enlargement was considered to amount to a "disproportionate enlargement". As a result the single-storey smaller extension has been removed and the larger rear extension has had its projection reduced twice before the third and final amendment.

I have been provided by the applicant with volume calculations of the size of the original dwelling and also those for the existing extension which are as follows:

Original Dwelling (i.e. as when first built before any enlargements)

Front portion sectional area (i.e. side elevation depth x height up to eaves added to depth x height from eaves to ridge) x original width of house = $34.26\text{m} \times 9.22\text{m} = 315.88\text{m}^3$

Rear (lounge) portion sectional area (taken from rear elevation) x depth/rear projection = $25.4 \times 6.49 = 164.85\text{m}^3$

Less hipped roof from front portion = 24.51m^3

Add roof makeup between front and rear portion = 12.69m^3

Add rear bay window = 5.59m^3

Total size of the original house = 474.5m^3

Previous Extension

Sectional area (side elevation) x width = $33.16 \times 4.37 = 144.9\text{m}^3$

Total Previous extension= 144.9m^3

I have carried out my own calculations and can verify the above figures are correct.

I have calculated the volume of the proposed amended rear extension, porch and dormer as follows:

Rear elevation section excluding gable: $4.7(\text{W}) \times 4.0 (\text{H}) = 18.8 \text{ m}^2$

Rear elevation section – gable: $4.7(\text{W}) \times 1.7(\text{H}) \times 0.5 = 4.00 \text{ m}^2$

Total section: 22.8m^2

X projection from rear wall (2.86m) = 65.2m^3

Roof Enlargement between rear extension and existing rear roof slope:

“gable section” – $4.0 \times \text{depth of } 3.66 \times 0.5 = 5.83$

Plus $1.5 \times 4.7 \times 1.0 \times 0.5 = 3.5$

Total: 9.33 m^3

REAR EXTENSION TOTAL: 74.5m^3

PORCH: 9.66 m^3

DORMER: 5.14 m^3

TOTAL PROPOSED ENLARGEMENT: 89.3 m^3

TOTAL ENLARGEMENT OF ORIGINAL HOUSE:

$144.9 + 89.3 = \mathbf{234.2\ m^3}$

PERCENTAGE ENLARGEMENT OF ORIGINAL HOUSE:

$234.2 / 474.5 \times 100 = \mathbf{49.4\%}$

As the total enlargement would be less than half of the size of the original dwelling and that the new proposed extensions would not lead to any increase in height of the dwelling or project any further to the side (other than the porch) or any further to the rear of rearmost part of the dwelling, I do not consider the proposal, as amended, would amount to a disproportionate enlargement of the original dwelling.

In terms of the particular design of the extensions, although the eaves height would be raised on the rear extension part, I consider that due to the projection of less than 3.0 metres and overall scale of the extension, this would not harmfully detract from the overall appearance of the house. Due to this being at the rear it would not be visually prominent when viewed from the road and the site is very well screened by woodland to the west and south (rear of the site). It would be screened from the north by the presence of the house and from the bungalow to the east, it would be screened by boundary hedging, a large boundary conifer tree and the presence of the existing rear living room projection. The porch would have pitched roof and gable which are features which match the house. The dormer is also very well screened and would not dominate the roof. The white render finishing materials for the porch and rear extension would contrast with the red-brick dwelling but this would not harm the overall character and appearance of the bungalow, which would not be ruined by the contemporary modern approach of the extension at the rear. There are other white/cream render finishes found at other dwellings in the area including the neighbouring bungalow and more traditional houses in the area.

With regard to residential amenity, due to the level of screening around the site as mentioned above and the distance between the extensions and nearby residential properties, there would be no harmful overlooking from the proposed upper floor windows or any other impacts such as overshadowing.

The proposal would result in a five-bed property but there is ample parking on the current driveway for at least three cars unobstructed by the proposed porch, in accordance with the Council's parking standards.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The amended proposal which reduces the scale of the rear extension is acceptable and would not amount to inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not harm the visual or residential amenities of the area. The proposal would comply with the Council's Local Plan (adopted September 2020) and is in line with the government planning guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : APPROVE

Case Officer: Chris Johnston
Recommendation Date: 18.2.22

X *B.J. Haywood*

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council