

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2024/0069
Valid 08/02/2024

STONE HOUSE
MACCLESFIELD ROAD
LEEK

ERECTION OF SINGLE
STOREY EXTENSIONS AND
PITCH ROOF TO EXISTING
GARAGE TO PROVIDE A
RESIDENTIAL ANNEX

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

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

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The site is in the open countryside between Leek to the south-east and Rudyard to the north-west and comprises a stone-built detached dwellinghouse, with a primary elevation facing south, and with a link extension at the rear connected to an original stone and tile outbuilding with adjacent canopy structure and a flat-roofed more modern triple garage block finished in white render and reconstituted stone. It lies in a spacious plot on the west side of A523 Macclesfield Road, which provides the access to the property via a long driveway. The property is surrounded largely by open land although there are a few sporadic dwellings (in spacious plots) to the north and west. The site is in the Green Belt.

PROPOSAL

This is a full householder planning application for single storey side extensions to the modern flat-roofed triple garage to the north of the house, which is attached to the stone outbuilding. The extended garage structure would be converted into a 2-bedroom family annex for the current occupants of the house, which is intended to be occupied by a family directly related to the current occupants. A pitched tiled roof would be added covering the whole of the extended garage. The east side extension would project 4.1 metres from the existing side wall of the garage, level with the east side wall of the adjacent stone outbuilding between the garage and the house. The west side extension would project 1.3m from the existing west side wall of the garage and would replace a small attached oil store structure.

The annex would also comprise living/kitchen areas and a bathroom as well as the two bedrooms. New windows would be inserted into all four elevations of the garage, either using existing openings (there are existing windows on the north/rear elevation of the garage) or bricking up existing openings and inserting new openings. The garage is currently integral to the house via a door into the outbuilding which is also internally linked with the house via the small modern link extension. The

proposal would keep this arrangement allowing mutual internal access between the main house and the annex although a new external “front door” would also be added for the annex along with bi-folds and patio doors opening out onto patio and existing garden areas to the south, west and north.

The single-storey side extensions to the garage are an amendment to the scheme originally submitted with this new application, which proposed an upward rather than side enlargements by raising the eaves and adding another storey to the garage with pitched roof and first-floor bedrooms within the new upper parts of the walls and roof.

The application itself is a resubmission of an earlier even larger annex scheme submitted in 2022 which proposed to completely replace the garage with a two-storey annex structure with a larger footprint and also extensions to the house (ref: SMD 2022 0181). This was refused permission in Feb 2023 for the following reasons:

1. The application site is in the Green Belt. Policy SS10 of the Council's Local Plan (adopted September 2020) requires strict control over inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The government planning guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in paragraphs 149 and 150 sets out the forms of development which are not inappropriate development in the Green Belt. It includes the enlargement of buildings providing this would not be disproportionate in relation to the original building. The proposal, by virtue of the garage building's height, scale, form and siting in relation to the dwellinghouse, together with the extensions to the dwellinghouse, would lead to a substantially disproportionate enlargement of the original building. The proposal therefore amounts inappropriate development in the Green Belt and is therefore harmful to its openness. Inappropriate development should only be allowed where there are very special circumstances, considered to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt, however no very special circumstances have been demonstrated or exist. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy SS10 of the Local Plan and also the NPPF.

2. The enlargement of the garage building and provision of an “annex” would by virtue of its scale, layout, form and siting in relation to the dwellinghouse, lead to a building which effectively would be a separate dwelling to the existing dwelling on site. Policy SS10 and H1 'New Housing' of the Local Plan only allows the conversion of rural buildings into new dwellings where the building is suitable and worthy in physical, architectural and character terms. It is not considered the flat-roofed garage building is worthy and suitable in architectural and character terms. The proposed extensions to the garage building are not appropriate in scale in relation to the existing dwelling and the overall extensions and conversion would create a development which is not subservient to the existing dwelling on site, in conflict with the Council's Design Guide (adopted in February 2018) and would be harmful to both the character and appearance of the dwelling and the character, appearance and amenities of the rural area. The proposal would therefore not comply with policies SS10, H1 or DC1 'Design Considerations' of the Local Plan and Sections 5 and 12 of the NPPF.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Staffs Moorlands Local Plan (adopted September 2020)

SS10 – Other Rural Areas Strategy

H1 – New Housing

DC1 – Design Considerations

NPPF (Revised December 2023)

Sections 5 (Housing), 12 (Design) and 13 (Green Belts).

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

SMD/2022/0181: Demolition of existing garage and replacement with two storey/single storey building to form double garage and two bed annex. Alterations and single storey extension to form family room. Refused 17.2.23.

87 00589: Pitched roof for flat-roofed garage and porch to house. Approved. The porch was built but not the roof to the garage.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 25.5.22

Neighbour consultation period ends: 25.5.22

Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

None.

Town / Parish Comments

No objection.

OFFICER COMMENTS

The site is in the Green Belt and Policy SS10, the strategy for the countryside, states there will be strict control over inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The NPPF in paras 154 and 155 lists the exceptional types of development which are not inappropriate in the Green Belt and which are therefore not harmful to its openness. The enlargement of buildings is listed providing this would not be disproportionate in relation to the original size of the building.

It was considered the previous scheme either by the enlargement of the garage or replacement would have amounted to disproportionate enlargements in relation to the scale of the original buildings and was refused permission.

The new scheme represents a much reduced scheme of enlargement. In order to assess if the proposed extensions would result in a disproportionate enlargement of the original buildings, volume calculations were undertaken.

It has been assessed that the original buildings or parts of buildings (those that existed in 1947 at the time of the original Town and Country Planning Act) are the entire house as it currently stands (apart from a canopy porch approved in 1987) and the stone outbuilding to the north of it, included the adjacent canopy structure which is largely part of the roof of the outbuilding.

In determining the previous application, it was considered earlier on that the house had been extended as a rectangular house footprint was shown on historical maps and the current house has front projections. However, later on in the process, better evidence was provided by the agent (on 16.9.22) in form of 1947 sales particulars which included all the room sizes of the house at the time which correlate with the current house as it currently stands and therefore it has been assessed that the original house has not been extended and that whole of the existing house is deemed to be 'original' (with the exception of a small canopy porch structure approved in 1987).

In determining the previous application, there was also some doubt as to whether the canopy structure to the west of the stone outbuilding was deemed to be an original part of the house. A 1952 conveyancing map (also included in the same email correspondence from the agent dated 16.9.22) would appear to show this structure and furthermore, the 1947 sales particulars do describe a "wood and coal store" (and it is feasible this would have been used for this purpose as it is largely open sided). On the balance of probabilities I consider there is sufficient evidence that the canopy structure is an original part of the property.

The above evidence can be found on the SMD 2022 0181 file.

The "additions" to the original buildings i.e. extensions or enlargements added after 1947 are deemed to be the detached flat-roofed triple garage (to be converted and extended) and the small flat-roofed link structure between the house and the outbuilding.

The agent has also provided volume calculations as shown in the amended elevations drawing which shows each identifiable part of the property shaded a different colour. The outcomes correlate with my calculations.

My calculations are as follows:

HOUSE - ORIGINAL

Green section of the elevation drawings: 492.5 cu.m

Pale blue section: 182 cu.m

Roof sections between pale blue and green: 16.8 cu.m

Purple: 57.4 cu.m

Roof sections between purple and green: 8.7 cu.m

Subtract for the side hip of the roof: 9.7 cu.m

TOTAL: 747.7 cu.m

OUTBUILDING – ORIGINAL (YELLOW)

71.1 cu.m

CANOPY – ORIGINAL (RED)

34.5 cu.m

TOTAL ORIGINAL 853.3 cu.m

ADDITIONS:

LINK EXTENSION BETWEEN HOUSE AND OUTBUILDING (DARK BLUE)

15 cu.m

TOTAL GARAGE AS PROPOSED TO BE EXTENDED

405 cu.m

TOTAL ADDITIONS

Garage (405 cu.m) plus link extension (15 cu.m) = 420 cu.m

PERCENTAGE ENLARGEMENT OF THE ORIGINAL BUILDINGS:

i.e. $420 \text{ divided by } 853.3 \times 100 = 49.2\%$

The porch to the house has not been included in either the original or enlargement calculations as this would not exceed 1 cu.m and such a de minimus addition would not in any case have any significant bearing on the outcome.

A detailed breakdown of my measurements and volume calculations can be found on the “Email Correspondence” folder of the current application file.

As the total enlargement of the original buildings as a result of the proposal would not exceed more than half the volume of the original buildings, it is not considered the proposal would result in a disproportionate enlargement of the original building(s) in this respect.

Aside from “volume” , it is also considered that due to the resultant individual dimensions of the enlargements in relation to those of the original buildings and in particular the height of the enlargements in relation to the original buildings, the proposal as a whole would not lead to a disproportionate enlargement in relation to the enlargements already existing. Although the pitched roof would raise the height of the garage, the proposed ridge would not exceed the eaves of the main part of the original property i.e. the house and would still be significantly lower and smaller than the house. The resultant garage building despite appearing detached to some extent from the main house and separated from it by smaller and lower buildings in between, would still appear subservient to the house, which should remain as the dominant building on site and the garage even as extended would respect the house’s continued dominance.

The previous schemes failed in this respect. The amendments forming this new application succeed in overcoming the first reason for refusal of the previous application. As the reduced scheme is now deemed to not amount to a disproportionate enlargement of the original buildings, the proposal is therefore not inappropriate development in the Green Belt and therefore complies with Section 13 of the NPPF and also in this respect, Policy SS10 of the Local Plan.

With regard to the second reason for refusal of the previous application, the form of the previous proposal would have resulted in a development akin to a separate dwelling in terms of size and layout and its siting, which would not have complied with Policy SS10 which does not allow new dwellings in the countryside unless they are, inter alia, conversions of suitable buildings in physical, architectural and character terms and the garage building was not considered suitable in appearance terms. However, this is a much reduced annex scheme and the resultant floorspace, by keeping to a single-storey, is no longer excessive in size for the purpose of a family annex. Its location in relation to the house and the fact that it would be integrated with the main house via an internal layout through the adjacent outbuilding and link is such that it would not be practical or desirable to subdivide into a completely separate dwelling or unit of accommodation. Conditions can be added to a planning permission requiring all aspects of the proposal including the internal layout to be provided in exact accordance with the plans and a further condition to restrict the use of the annex for purposes entirely ancillary to that of the main dwelling and to be occupied by relatives of the applicant and not sold off or rented out.

I consider that the revised scheme overcomes the second reason for refusal.

With regard to other planning matters, such as the design and impact on the visual amenities of the area, the pitched roof, despite enlarging the building, would improve its appearance and make it more in keeping with the traditional dwelling on site and the more historic and rural character and appearance of the area. The roof design was further amended to reflect the pitch angles of the adjacent outbuilding and main house and the gable sided form also replicates parts of the roof design of both. The proposed bi-folds and floor to ceiling windows/patio doors are not out of keeping with the modern flat-roofed garage building and the smaller proposed windows replicate the smaller windows of the main house. The garage building is in any case very well screened by boundary hedges and trees and is not prominent from roads and public footpaths in the area. The proposed designs would not harm the character and appearance of the area. Due to the distance of the garage building from the nearest dwellings outside of the property, there would also be no harm to residential amenity.

There is no requirement to provide a Biodiversity Net Gain as the application was submitted before April and it also does not appear to lead to the loss of 25 sq.m of potential habitat.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The amended proposal is for a significantly scaled down garage enlargement to provide a family annex of an appropriate size. The extensions together with the

garage would not amount to a disproportionate enlargement of the original house and is therefore not inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not harm its openness. The amended scheme succeeds in overcoming the reasons for refusal of the previous application. It is also acceptable in design and appearance terms and would not harm the visual or residential amenities of the area with the safeguard of conditions. The amended proposal therefore complies with the Council's Local Plan and the government planning guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : APPROVE

Case Officer: Chris Johnston
Recommendation Date: 4.10.24

X 

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council