

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2022/0059
Valid 07/02/2022

BRAMBLE COTTAGE
STANLEY MOSS LANE
STOCKTON BROOK

PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY
REAR EXTENSION

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Green Belt
- Design

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

Previously much altered and extended two storey stone and brick cottage linked to adjacent larger Mill House at 2 Stanley Moss Lane. An existing modern conservatory projects off the rear elevation by 4.1m and has a width (confined to the rear elevation of 3.6m).

PROPOSAL

Single storey rear extension with projection also extending beyond the line of the side elevation. Amended plans were received 5th April 2022 ref 100-01A. The application is a re-submission of an earlier withdrawn larger scheme.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Local Plan (adopted 9th September 2020)

SS1 Development Principles
SS2 Settlement Hierarchy
SS10 Other Rural Areas Area Strategy
DC1 Design Considerations
DC2 The Historic Environment
NE1 Biodiversity and Geological Resources
NE2 Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows
T1 Development and Sustainable Transport

National Planning Policy Framework February 2019

Paragraph(s) 1 – 14;
Section(s) 4 – Decision making; 8 Promoting healthy and safe communities; 11 – Making effective use of land; 12 – Achieving well designed places; 13 – Protecting Green Belt Land; 15 – Conserving and enhancing the natural environment; 16 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Adopted Supplementary Planning Documents/Guidance (SPD/G):

- Space About Dwellings SPG
- Design Principles SPG
- Design Guide SPD adopted 21st February 2018

Local Plan Supporting Evidence Documents:

- Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment (2008)

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

SMD/2013/1114 – conservatory – approved

SMD/2021/0728 – single storey rear extension – withdrawn

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 17th March 2022

Neighbour consultation period ends: 1st March 2022

Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

None

Town / Parish Comments

Bagnall Parish Council – no objection

Severn Trent Water

Due to a change in processes, no longer commenting on domestic extensions under the planning application process. Domestic extensions are dealt with by Building Regulations, and if an asset is affected by the works, then the applicant will need to contact the Buildover team within Networks Solutions team at STW to discuss the proposals.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

Development is supported in principle subject to meeting the Government's Green Belt policy (SMDC Local Plan policy SS10 s.6 refers).

As a dwelling with (so far as can be ascertained, and with no reason to doubt) intact PD rights, there are various options for rear or side extensions. Whilst rear extensions would be limited to up to 3m, under the larger homes option an extension up to 6m subject to neighbour notification could be possible.

The width of the original dwelling scales from plan as being 8.4m. A side extension of up to 4.2m could also therefore be possible. Where a permitted rear extension overlaps (steps out) beyond the side it would be PD subject to not being wider in total (including along the rear elevation) than half the width of the original dwelling –

in this case therefore not wider than 4.2m. This scheme would exceed that limit by 700mm.

In ground plan area measured externally the original dwelling has an area of 47m². The proposed extension would add 27m² which would represent an increase of 57%. (The earlier withdrawn scheme had proposed a 7.2m x 6m extension or 43m² – a near 100% increase). The revised scheme is still a larger extension than would commonly be accepted where the LPA is supportive generally of increases of up to 30%. However the LPA is aware that significant permitted development options could be utilised here. The current proposal takes the place of an existing conservatory and adds 830mm to its rear length and 1.5m to its width. The further additional impacts are therefore modest. Although alternative PD schemes have not been submitted, the options which could be envisaged include retention of the conservatory (or a larger conservatory) whilst also building to the side of the original side elevation.

Whilst the possible 6m rear extension under PD subject to neighbour notification has not been tested, there would only be LPA assessment if there were neighbour objection and it can readily be seen that with existing blank walls on the neighbour's side to 5.5m any adverse effect on neighbour amenity would be unlikely.

The applicant particularly wishes to have a side door as shown. A scheme which provided this same side extension to accommodate a door could be achieved by PD if the width of the rear extension were reduced – achievable by in effect increasing the gap to the neighbour on the northern side elevation to c.1.6m. This would not significantly alter the impact of the overall development on openness as the gap is in a concealed location.

In plain terms the development proposed would result in disproportionate additions (57%). However, in view of the considerations discussed above based on PD options it can be concluded that there are very special circumstances that would enable the development to be regarded as not inappropriate in this case.

Design

Walls are proposed in “stone work to match existing” and the roof to be tiled “to match existing”. Although the application form refers to “blue/grey roofing slates” as being the existing roof material, they are in fact Staffordshire style tiles and likely to be traditional clay tiles.

Matching stone window heads, cills and quoin details are proposed.

The scheme takes the place of a conservatory with conspicuous modern glazed roof and would install a more traditional style roof in terms of material finish. Although the roof slope is shallow and may not support traditional tiles a resembling tile system would be possible. The small roof light in the southerly roof slope should be excluded by condition to avoid drawing further unnecessary attention in public street scene views.

Amended plans were obtained to ensure the side door has a semi gabled portico rather than a weak roof slope as first shown and therefore to be more in keeping with the traditional forms of the original dwelling and provide a bolder entrance.

It should be noted that neighbouring developments in this residential cul-de-sac are principally modern late 20th C and of individual varied design style.

Amenity

There would be no adverse effects on neighbour amenity by way of overlooking or loss of privacy. Ample garden space would be retained for the application property.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

Having found the scheme to be acceptable in the green belt on the basis of very special circumstances as discussed and finding the design, following revisions, to be of good quality and adopting a high standard of materials in the external finishes the scheme is recommended for approval.

In view of the reliance on PD factors in justification of the scheme further PD rights should be removed by condition.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: **approve**

Case Officer: Arne Swithenbank

Recommendation Date: 06.04.2022

X 

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council