

Design and Access Statement

Proposed demolition of existing domestic store buildings and erection of new attached garage, home workshop, utility and rear entrance with store cum gym with ensuite annexed above, replacement of existing porch with new bay window. Extension of hardstanding to existing drive to existing vehicular entrance gate

Mainwaring Farm, Congleton Road, Mow Cop, Stoke on Trent, ST7 3PJ

James Bell Architecture Ltd

Rural Architecture & Residential Property

Design and Access Statement

Proposed demolition of existing domestic store buildings and erection of new attached garage, home workshop, utility and rear entrance with store cum gym with ensuite annexed above, replacement of existing porch with new bay window. Extension of hardstanding to existing drive to existing vehicular entrance gate

Client: Mr and Mrs Roberts

Site Address: Mainwaring Farm, Congleton Road, Mow Cop, Stoke on Trent,

Local Authority: Staffordshire Moorlands Council

Document Ref: 21061DAS

Revision: -

Date: 22nd March 2024

James Bell Architecture Ltd

Rural Architecture & Residential Property

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This statement is prepared by James Bell Architecture Ltd on behalf of Mr and Mrs Roberts in preparation of the full planning application for the proposed demolition of existing domestic store buildings and erection of new attached garage, home workshop, utility and rear entrance with store cum gym with ensuite annexed above, replacement of existing porch with new bay window. Extension of hardstanding to existing drive to existing vehicular entrance gate
- 1.2 The purpose of this report is to provide an objective appraisal of the development. This statement depicts the proposals, describes the site and the surrounding area and outlines the context for assessing the development, giving due consideration to relevant local and national planning policy.

2. Location

- 2.1 Mainwaring Farm is located on the very south westerly periphery of Staffordshire Moorlands' Authority. The boundary runs alongside the applicant's boundary

3. The Site Description

Physical Context and Background to the Proposals

- 3.1 Planning permissions references SMD/1987/0391 and SMD/1987/0808 granted for a replacement dwelling incorporating granny flat therein.
- 3.2 The application site consists of 1no. detached residential dwellinghouse with 5no. domestic ancillary store buildings therein.
- 3.3 There are 3no existing accesses on to Congleton Road which include 2no. vehicular and 1no. pedestrian.
- 3.4 The site has a generous 0.2 ha curtilage. Surrounding this, the applicants own two adjoining fields, one to the rear and one to the south east on the opposing side of Congleton Road and bordering Tower Hill Road. Neither field is used agriculturally as the name sake 'Mainwaring Farm' would otherwise suggest. The application site is wholly domestic and there has not been, nor has there been since 1987 when the house was

built, any agricultural occupancy of the existing buildings sought for replacement as part of this application. The buildings are in poor condition and require replacement.

- 3.5 The dwelling house is 2 storey with a mixture of stone and render cladding with dormered windows to the front elevation.
- 3.6 The site lies within the Green Belt of the Local Plan

4. Evaluation of the Proposed Development

Principle of Development

- 4.1 The proposals seek the replacement of the existing domestic store buildings which are in a poor condition with a new building that is attached to the rear of the dwellinghouse.
- 4.2 The dwellinghouse will retain an annex component.
- 4.3 The property has not been altered since 1987 when it was originally constructed. Thus, extensions and alterations would generally be acceptable provided they accord with local policies H1, SS1 and the SPGs

Architecture

- 4.4 The existing store buildings are of poor condition and are of no architectural merit.
- 4.5 The proposed addition is positioned to the rear of the dwelling and lower in height, thus treated subserviently to the dwelling. It has a stone frontage with partial dormer to one window and a large tripartite arched door to service the workshop/store therein. The proposed addition is designed to imitate a 'barn-like' style which is sympathetic to the sites' homage as a former farm.
- 4.6 The proposals will involve partial removal of the existing embankment to facilitate the extension, however this will mean that the extension will be silhouetted by landform and thus would not be intrusive in the landscape.
- 4.7 The gable elevation of the extension will be treated in render to match the dwellinghouse

and again with a large tripartite arched door to access the garage.

- 4.8 The proposals incorporate a new side door which shall lead in to a new double height hallway and would therefore be more distinctive as the primary entrance to the property leading off the drive and from the approach.
- 4.9 The applicant's pastime is to bike ride and he has numerous bikes and vehicles he likes to store, repair and ride, hence the need to replace the existing home workshop with a more permanent and warmer space.
- 4.10 The existing front door and porch shall be replaced by an attractive stone window bay to provide a feature on the front elevation.

Parking and External Space

- 4.11 The existing vehicular access will be closed off. The existing north westerly access shall be retained and solely used for vehicles
- 4.12 A pedestrian gate shall be retained for postal deliveries.
- 4.13 There is ample new parking areas for more than 3 cars in the main drive

Trees and Landscaping

- 4.14 There are no significant works to trees proposed other than removal of ornamental shrubs which shall be replaced with the overall planned future garden enhancement,

Mass and Scale

- 4.12 As previously described, the proposed extension is designed to be positioned to the rear of the dwelling and has a lower roofline compared to the main dwellinghouse, thus is a subservient addition.

Amount

- 4.13 The proposed extension represents a modest 5.4% increase in built form (footprint) over the existing buildings and is 1.6% smaller in floorspace. The volume increase is 24% which is considered acceptable and is non-materially larger from a planning perspective.

The footprint, floorspace and volume figures are presented below:

	Existing	Proposed	% difference
Foot Print	255 sqm	269 sqm	+5.4%
Floor Space	366 sqm	360 sqm	-1.6%
Volume	1,095 cubic m	1,365 cubic m	+24%

Planning Policy

4.13 The key planning criteria for assessment in respect of design are:

- NPPF Policies
- Local Policies - Particularly H1 which allows for replacement of existing buildings for new buildings.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- 4.14 The glossary to the Framework (NPPF page 70) defines previously developed land as: “Land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land (although it should not be assumed that the whole of the curtilage should be developed) and any associated fixed surface infrastructure. This excludes: land that is or was last occupied by agricultural or forestry buildings; land that has been developed for minerals extraction or waste disposal by landfill, where provision for restoration has been made through development management procedures; land in built-up areas such as residential gardens, parks, recreation grounds and allotments; and land that was previously developed but where the remains of the permanent structure or fixed surface structure have blended into the landscape.”
- 4.15 The application proposes the demolition of the above-mentioned buildings and construction of a new attached structure to the dwellinghouse within the curtilage of a dwelling-house.
- 4.16 Paragraph 145 of the Framework states that a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate development in the Green Belt. However, paragraph 145 also goes on to list 7 exceptions where development is not inappropriate. Sub paragraph g) confirms that the redevelopment of previously developed land is one such exception and reads thusly:

“Limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would: Not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development”

- 4.17 The NPPF provides the broad national policy for development within the Green Belt which generally aligns with Staffordshire Moorlands Policy H1 and SS1 in assessment that a replacement building(s) must not pose a greater impact than the ones that they replace

Openness of Green Belt

- 4.18 There is no definition of “openness” within the Framework; however, the issue has been considered by the courts. In the judgment in *Timmins v Gedling BC* (2014 EWHC 654 (Admin)) “openness” was said simply to mean “an absence of any buildings or development” (paragraph 26).
- 4.19 The issue of openness is considered further in the judgment of *Turner v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and East Dorset Council* ([2016] EWCA Civ 466). In *Turner*, it was held that the “openness of the Green Belt” is not narrowly limited to a volumetric approach. The word “openness” is open-textured and a number of factors are capable of being relevant when it comes to applying it to the particular facts of a specific case. Prominent among these will be factors relevant to how built up the Green Belt is now and how built up the Green Belt would be if redevelopment occurs (in the context of which, volumetric matters may be a material concern, but are by no means the only one); and factors relevant to the visual impact on the aspect of openness which the Green Belt presents.

Other Planning Considerations

- 4.27 Key considerations include the following
- Improvement to levels of insulation throughout
 - Replacement boiler, updated electrics etc
 - Improvement of landscape appearance

5. Summary

- 5.1 This design statement supports an application for planning permission for the alterations and extensions to improve and modernise a number of domestic buildings by consolidating these in to one structure which shall be attached to the dwelling.
- 5.2 There is a high-quality material palette proposed in the development that will ensure it blends with the specific context, local area and genealogy of the site. The proposed dwelling extension is respectfully and beautifully designed in a traditional style whilst interpreting the former / historical use of the site.
- 5.3 The dwelling has not been extended since its construction in 1987
- 5.4 In terms of mass, scale and visual impact, the proposed extension is considered respectful and subservient and does not pose any material harm to the site, the wider setting or the Green Belt
- 5.6 The proposals will create a more functional family dwelling and remove some old and unsightly buildings that contribute little to the landscape character.