DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2024/0187 **Valid 29/04/2024**	**27 ASH BANK ROAD** **WERRINGTON**	**ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION** **(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)**

MAIN ISSUES

- Development in the Green Belt.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE
The site is a detached, two-storey red brick dwellinghouse with a hipped tile roof, dating from the 1930's. The property has a more modern single storey side and rear extension, off which the proposed extension is to be built. The site is in the Green Belt.

PROPOSAL
The proposal is for a single storey lean-to side extension, which will add to an existing side extension. The proposal will be 3.65 metres total height, 2.57 metres to the eaves, 2.5 metres wide, and will extend forward to the existing by 6 metres, however it will not come forward of the principal elevation of the original dwellinghouse. The proposal will be 15.12m^2. All measurements are approximate.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan (Adopted 2020)

SS1 Development Principles
SS10 Other Rural Areas Strategy
DC1 Design Considerations
T1 Development and Sustainable Transport

National Planning Policy Framework

Paragraph(s) 1 -14, 47, 131, 135, 154.
Section(s) 4 – Decision making, 12 – Achieving well designed and beautiful places, 13 – Protecting Green Belt Land.

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

- Design Principles for Development in the Staffordshire Moorlands
- Staffordshire Moorlands Design Guide SPD
- Space About Dwellings SPD

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

- None.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: Expired
Neighbour consultation period ends: Expired
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments
None received.

Town / Parish Comments
None received.

Staffordshire County Council Highways
Acceptance.

Severn Trent Water
Standard comments regarding unmapped assets.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development
In accordance with Policies SS1 and SS2 of the Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan the Council expects all new development to make a positive contribution towards the sustainability of communities and to protect and where possible enhance the environment. The site is within the Green Belt and therefore needs to meet one of the exceptions for development in the Green belt, as laid out in paragraph 154 of the NPPF. In this case, the relevant part is paragraph 154 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*'. The site has extant extensions which historic maps show to have been built after 1 July 1948, and therefore cannot be defined as part of the 'original building', as defined in Annex 2 of the NPPF. The original building is therefore considered to have a footprint of 51m^2, and later extensions totalling to 49m^2. The addition of the proposed extension at 15m^2 would bring the total footprint of extensions to 64m^2, or 125% of the original building, which would be considered disproportionate, and therefore the proposal is unacceptable in principle.

Design
SMDC Policy DC1 requires development to be of a high quality and add value to the local area, incorporating creativity, detailing and materials appropriate to the character of the area; and be designed to respect the site and its surroundings and promote a positive sense of place and identity through its scale, height, density, layout, siting, character and appearance.

Paragraphs 131 and 135 of the NPPF outline what is expected of good design and required for the development of high quality, beautiful places, and provides for a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Staffordshire Moorlands District Council's Design Guide SPD outlines the Council's expectations in respect of design and states that extensions should harmonise with the parent building. For a development to be considered appropriate in terms of its size and massing, the Council would universally expect to see extensions subordinate to the dominance of the original building. In this case, the proposed extension remains subordinate to the original as it is single storey, and is set back from the principal elevation. The proposal is also in keeping, as it will be red brick with a tile roof to match the existing, and it is to be of the same proportions as an extant side extension. In design terms the proposal is acceptable.

Amenity
Paragraph 135 f) of the NPPF seeks to secure a high standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants. Local Plan Policy DC1 requires development to achieve a satisfactory relationship to adjacent development and to not cause unacceptable effects by reason of visual intrusion, overlooking, shadowing, overbearing effect, noise, light pollution or other adverse impacts on local character and amenity.

The site is bounded by 25 Ash Bank to the west, and 29 to the east. The proposal would have no amenity impact on No.29 due to the siting of the proposal on the western side of the property. the proposal would not have a greater impact on No.25 as the proposal is single storey and set back from the principal elevation of the site, therefore the proposal would not overshadow 25, and with no windows facing west, 25 would not be overlooked. The proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of amenity.

Highway Safety
Paragraph 104 of the NPPF states that patterns of movement, streets, parking and other transport considerations are integral to the design of schemes and contribute to making high quality places. Policy T1 seeks to provide safe and sustainable access and ensure that development does not lead to an increase in on street parking. The proposal would not remove parking availability, nor add an additional bedroom the proposal would therefore have no impact on highway safety as the site can demonstrate ample off-street parking. The proposal is therefore compliant with Policy T1.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE
The proposal does not meet the criteria for an exception for development in the Green Belt as set out in paragraph 154 of the NPPF and therefore is unacceptable in principle, as it would amount to a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building. A Permitted Development fall back was considered, however as the proposal links with an existing development which is more than half the width of the original house, and extends from the rear elevation by more than 4 metres, the proposal would not meet the criteria for permitted development.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : **Refuse.**

Case Officer: Reuben Berriman
Recommendation Date: 25/06/2024

X B.J. Haywood

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council