

## DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

---

**SMD/2021/0641**  
**Valid 04/10/2021**

**486 ASH BANK ROAD**  
**WERRINGTON**

**REAR EXTENSION WITH  
MODIFICATION TO ROOF AND  
REMOVAL OF CHIMNEYS/FRONT  
PORCH**

**(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)**

---

### MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of development (Green Belt);
- Design and visual impact;
- Neighbour amenity;
- Parking;
- Coal.

### DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site is number 486 Ash Bank Road, a detached, brick and tile bungalow. The dwelling benefits from some roof space accommodation which is served by a single dormer window within the principal elevation. The dwelling has a hipped roof with a small, forwards projecting gable at the front of the house. Land levels drop significantly from the main road towards the southern (rear) boundary. Boundaries consist a mix of timber fencing, brick and blockwork walls as well as hedgerows. There are far reaching southern views to the open countryside. Off-road parking is provided within the domestic curtilage, with a drive/parking area at the front of the house and an attached garage.

For the purposes of planning policy consideration the application site is located within the Green Belt and a coal development (low-risk area). The site does not contain any Listed buildings/structures and is not within the setting of any structure (Listed or otherwise) with any identified historic interest. The site does not form part of any Conservation Area and there are no protected trees which need to be considered.

### PROPOSAL

The application proposes extensions to the front and rear of the bungalow, alterations to the roof including raising the eaves, changing the shape of the roof to a half-hip design, replacement of the existing dormer window with roof lights and the addition of a new (larger dormer) within the principal elevation roof slope. Existing chimneys would be removed. Extension of the loft space would provide extended living accommodation. To the rear there would be a shallow stretch of sloping roof above first floor rear windows, large expanses of glazing, roof lantern within a flat roof and a lower ground floor games room which would be accessed internally as well as externally. The extensions would be built in brick. The dwelling would undergo extensive internal remodelling with all bedrooms and bathroom being located at first floor level.

It is noted that the proposed plans have been amended since submission of the application, the plans now being considered are 1419-001 Revision B; 1419-002 Revision B and 01 of 01.

### RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

## Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan

|            |                                       |
|------------|---------------------------------------|
| SS1        | Development Principles                |
| SS10       | Other Rural Areas Strategy            |
| DC1        | Design Considerations                 |
| T1         | Development and Sustainable Transport |
| Appendix 2 | Parking Guidance                      |

## Supplementary Planning Guidance

1. Design Principles for Development in the Staffordshire Moorlands: New Dwellings and Extensions to Dwellings.
2. Space About Dwellings.

## Supplementary Planning Document

1. Staffordshire Moorlands Design Guide

## National Planning Policy Framework

Including sections;

- |     |                                        |
|-----|----------------------------------------|
| 2:  | Achieving sustainable development      |
| 6:  | Building a strong, competitive economy |
| 9:  | Promoting sustainable transport        |
| 12: | Achieving well-designed places         |
| 13: | Protecting Green Belt land.            |

## **SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS**

None

## **CONSULTATIONS**

### Publicity

Site Notice. Expired  
Neighbour consultation period. Expired.

Public Comments: None received.

Werrington Parish Council: No representations received.

Severn Trent Water: No representations received.

## **OFFICER COMMENTS**

### Principle of Development

The application site is located within the Green Belt therefore requiring consideration of section 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the relevant Green Belt/open countryside policies of the council's adopted Local Plan. Paragraph number 149 of the NPPF states that Local Planning Authorities should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate development unless they comply with one of the 7 listed exceptions. One of the exceptions is part 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.' Paragraph 147 (NPPF) states that 'inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.' Consideration is therefore given to whether the proposed extension (together with any previous additions) results in a 'disproportionate addition' and if so whether there are any very special circumstances to justify the development.

Local Plan policy SS10 confirms support for domestic extensions 'provided they are appropriate in scale and design and do not have a detrimental impact on the existing dwelling and the character of the rural area.' SS10 continues to state that 'the Council will assess schemes having regard to the original dwelling, in cases where cumulative change has occurred.'

Policy DC1 is a focused design policy where there is a requirement for schemes to be of a high quality and add value to the local area. The policy also requires for proposals to be designed to respect the site and their surroundings and protect the amenity of the area.

The council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Design Principles for Development' and Supplementary Planning Document 'Staffordshire Moorlands Design Guide' are also relevant and will be looked at closely later on in the report. Determination of whether the extensions to the dwelling are inappropriate development involves assessment of their design.

### Design and visual impact

It is noted that the design and scale of the proposed extensions have been amended since submission of the application. The applicant has confirmed that the plans now before the council (and referenced within the 'Proposals' section of the report) are the ones which he would like the decision based on. The scheme proposes extensive alterations and extensions to the dwelling. The changes include alterations to the roof including eaves and ridge height increases, change from a hip to a half-hip roof design, replacement and repositioning of the dormer window, loss of chimney stacks, first floor front extension, two-storey rear extensions and lower ground floor accommodation. The internal layout of the dwelling would be altered dramatically, the lower ground floor would have an enlarged room which would be accessed internally and externally (currently a much smaller store room with external access only). The ground floor would consist of a study, garage, dog room, utility room, WC, large reception hallway, extended lounge, large kitchen and dining room. The dwelling currently has one bedroom within the roof space, the proposed plans show that the roof alterations (eaves and ridge height increases) would provide space for 4 large bedrooms and a separate bathroom.

Local Plan policy DC1 and the NPPF seek to secure well-designed developments which should respect the site and its surroundings and promote a positive sense of place and identity through its scale, height, density, layout, siting, landscaping, character and appearance (DC1). Considering DC1 alongside Local Plan policy SS10 and the SPG and SPD design principles

(referred to earlier in the report), it is clear that the proposal does not comply with the required design parameters. Of relevance are the following requirements from both the SPG and SPD.

#### Supplementary Planning Guidance

- Extensions should be subordinate to the existing building so that the original building dominates;
- The size and shape of the extension should respect the height and proportions of the existing house to ensure the new addition fits neatly with the old.
- In order to achieve the secondary appearance, the ridge height of the extension should be lower than the existing, certainly no higher
- Roof form should be simple with a dominant roof line.
- Traditional elevations in the rural area of Staffordshire Moorlands tend to be simple with an uncomplicated arrangement of small window and door openings which are limited in number, giving a strong solid to void relationship. A common design failing is to 'over-window' an elevation which visually weakens the structure.
- The design of the extension should follow the style of the existing building. In considering extensions the window and door sizes, proportions and designs should be from the same 'family' as those of the original dwelling.
- Large picture windows should be avoided (although the council does recognise that there are properties within the moorlands which have larger window/door openings, however each scheme has to be considered on its own merits.

#### Supplementary Planning Document – Staffordshire Moorlands Design Guide

- All extensions should harmonise with the parent building. An extension should respect the dominance of the original building and be subordinate to it in terms of its size and massing. Setting back the new section from the building line and keeping the eaves and ridge lower than the parent building will help.
- The smaller the parent building, the fewer the options for extension for example A two storey rear extension to a small cottage is unlikely to be acceptable, even on the rear.

Throughout the course of considering the application, the architect and applicant have been advised of these requirements. The documentation is also on the councils website for applicants/architects to review independently. Whilst the plans have been amended (following on from meetings/email exchanges/review of amended plans), it is still the case that the scheme does not comply to design requirements. The raised eaves and ridge height, together with change in the shape of the roof, instantly alter the simplistic and original form of the dwelling. The two-storey front gable does not relate well to the eaves height to which it would be attached, would be a clash of design style and would be a dominant and detrimental feature upon this principal elevation. The combination of the two-storey gable, proposed eaves height (raised in height from original) and additional courses of brickwork above the ground floor windows would confuse the style of the property, it neither reading as a bungalow nor a two-storey house whilst losing the original character of the bungalow. The extent of glazing at first floor within the two-storey front gable and the dormer window appear odd, completely contrasting with the simplistic nature of the existing windows.

The proportions, size and design of the existing side and rear elevations would be completely lost to the proposed alterations. The legibility of the existing side elevations would be completely lost, in terms of their sizes and design, the raised ridge and eaves height together with the significantly sized rear wings would detrimentally alter the form of the bungalow which is generally a rectangular shaped footprint with small front and rear projections. The proposal would see the footprint generally 'squared-off' and altered to one which is virtually as deep as

it is wide, again a loss of character. The proposed rear extension would result in the entire existing rear elevation being lost. The two-storey extensions, vast expanses of glazing, first floor extension between the projecting wings and large lower ground floor extension/excavation, results in the dwelling having a three-storey appearance, far removed from its current bungalow appearance with small lower level, garden storage area.

The plans show that the proposed extensions and alterations would completely overwhelm the bungalow on all sides to the point where the character and ability to recognise the original building is completely lost. The extensions by virtue of their scale and design overwhelm the original building, are not subservient to it and would result in a loss of its distinctive character and appearance as a mid-20th century bungalow. It cannot be said that the scheme complies with the adopted design policies, SPG or SPD documents.

In terms of visual impact, the effects of the development would extend far beyond the boundaries of the application site. The dwelling is visually prominent from the road. There are some design variations to surrounding properties but the character is mainly that of simple hipped roofs with some gable features. The scheme would result in the loss of the distinctive character of a mid-20<sup>th</sup> Century bungalow which currently sits comfortably within its setting.

#### Neighbour amenity

Dwellings surround the application site to the north, west and east although to the west there is a significant separation distance between the buildings. There are no neighbour amenity issues in respect of the dwelling to the west, or those to the north across the road. The dwelling most likely to be affected is number 488 Ash Bank Road which is positioned to the east. The site visit showed that the neighbours property does sit close to the boundary however the closest part of the neighbour's house to the boundary is in fact an attached garage with a rear lean-to conservatory structure. The main body of the neighbouring dwelling sits on the other side of the garage, therefore there are no nearby principal windows which would be affected. The windows within the proposed extension would allow for some overlooking however, this would generally be limited to the rear garden and not directly into any habitable windows.

#### Parking

Off-road parking space is located at the front of the property and the bungalow currently benefits from an integral garage. The scheme involves the retention of an integral garage but its small proportions will not realistically make this space practical for vehicular parking. The application proposes 4 bedrooms, therefore Local Plan standards require 3 off-road spaces. The existing parking space is sufficiently sized for 3 vehicles to park. The scheme does not propose any loss of the parking space.

#### Coal development area

Planning records show that the application site sits within a Coal Development Low Risk area and therefore it is reasonable to consider the surrounding area and any coal mining features/hazards. A Coal Mining Risk Assessment would not be required for this application. The Coal Authorities' 'Exemptions List' for the Risk Based Approach to Development Management identifies a householder application as one instance where an assessment is not required. In the event of planning permission being approved it is recommended that a coal related informative note is added to the decision.

## **CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE**

The application site is located within the Green Belt where development is strictly controlled. The proposed extension would amount to a disproportionate addition to the original building consequently reducing openness and comprising inappropriate development within the Green Belt. The proposed works are clearly 'inappropriate development' due to non-compliance with

NPPF paragraph number 145(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.' No very special circumstances have been demonstrated and the development would reduce the openness of the Green Belt.

Design guidance requires that all extensions should harmonise with the parent building. An extension should respect the dominance of the original building and be subordinate to it in terms of its size and massing. The extensions by virtue of their scale and design overwhelm the original building and are not subservient to it.

The council has advised the applicant and architect that the scheme does not comply with adopted policies (both national and local). A number of revised scheme have been looked at and a meeting has been held with the applicant, his agent, the Planning Case officer and the Head of Development Services. Unfortunately it has not been possible to secure a proposal which suits the applicants desired level of accommodation and which complies with Green Belt and design policies. The applicant has requested the application be refused with the intent to appeal the decision.

**OFFICER RECOMMENDATION :** Refuse

**Case Officer:** Lisa Jackson

**Recommendation Date:** 23/03/2022

X *B.J. Haywood*

---

Signed by: Ben Haywood

**On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council**