

Planning Committee: 23 April 2019

Item Number: 13

Application No: [W 19 / 0148](#)

Town/Parish Council: Stoneleigh
Case Officer: Liz Galloway
01926 456528 Liz.galloway@warwickdc.gov.uk

Registration Date: 31/01/19
Expiry Date: 28/03/19

17 Stoneleigh Close, Stoneleigh, Coventry, CV8 3DE

Increase in ridge height by 1.4 metres to provide first floor accommodation and repositioned chimney. FOR Mr & Mrs B Allard

This application is being presented to Committee because comments in support have been received from 5 members of the public and the Parish Council, and the application is recommended for refusal.

RECOMMENDATION

Planning Committee is recommended to refuse this application for the reasons set out at the end of the report.

DETAILS OF THE DEVELOPMENT

This application is a resubmission of a similar application which was refused last year. Amendments have been made to omit a single storey side extension. As before, the application seeks permission to add a first floor to the bungalow by raising the ridge height from 5.5m to 7m. Furthermore, the proposed first floor level has been reduced from 3 bedrooms to 2 incorporating a roof void above the kitchen/dining room. This has reduced the proposed floor space at first floor in comparison to the previous application, although the overall bulk of this element remains the same since the omission of the floorspace is only an internal change. A chimney is also proposed to be added to the property.

THE SITE AND ITS LOCATION

The application relates to a detached bungalow situated to the north west of Stoneleigh Close and is washed over by Green Belt. The site and the street are sloping, with the property in an elevated position compared to the entrance of its driveway and is also elevated in comparison to the properties on the opposite side of the street. It is at a similar level to that of the properties to either side.

The original property was built in the 1960's, and has since had a side extension which includes the utility, and a forward extension of the garage.

PLANNING HISTORY

W/18/0247 - Refused - Erection of first floor and ground floor side extension (resubmission of application ref: W/17/0517).

W/17/0517 - Refused and dismissed at appeal - Erection of first floor to bungalow and erection of single storey side extension

4133 - 1962 - Granted - Erection of bungalow and garage

4086 - 1961 - Granted - Erection of bungalow and garage

RELEVANT POLICIES

- National Planning Policy Framework
- BE1 - Layout and Design (Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029)
- BE3 - Amenity (Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029)
- H14 - Extensions to Dwellings in the Open Countryside (Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029)
- DS18 - Green Belt (Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029)
- NE2 - Protecting Designated Biodiversity and Geodiversity Assets (Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029)
- Residential Design Guide (Supplementary Planning Document- May 2018)
- The 45 Degree Guideline (Supplementary Planning Guidance)
- TR3 - Parking (Warwick District Local Plan - 2011-2029)
- Parking Standards (Supplementary Planning Document)

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

Cllr Trevor Wright: Support, the proposals would be in accordance with the NPPF and is strongly supported by local residents and the Parish Council.

Cllr Pamela Redford: Support, the development will sit comfortably within the street scene.

Stoneleigh and Ashow Parish Council: Support.

WCC Ecology: Recommended bat note, bird note and reptiles and amphibians note

Public Responses: 12 letters of support, the proposal would have no harmful impact on amenity, would not represent a disproportionate extension within the Green Belt, would be acceptable in design terms and would provide a dwelling which meets the needs of the applicants.

ASSESSMENT

Whether the proposal is appropriate development in the Green Belt and, if not, whether there are any very special circumstances which outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm identified

Paragraph 79 of the NPPF notes that the Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances (paragraph 87). With a number of exceptions, the construction of new buildings (including extensions) is inappropriate development (paragraph 89). Among the

exceptions is "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 explanatory text to Local Plan Policy DS18 states that the meaning of the exception in relation to disproportionate extensions is expanded upon by Local Plan Policy H14. Policy H14 states that extensions to dwellings will be permitted unless they result in disproportionate additions to the original dwelling which do not respect the character of the original dwelling; do not retain the openness of the rural area; or substantially alter the scale, design and character of the original dwelling. Policy H14 goes on to indicate that an extension of more than 30% of the gross floor space of the original dwelling is likely to be considered disproportionate in the Green Belt.

The total original floor space of the application property is calculated to be 157.53 sqm. The non-original existing garage extension amounts to 11 sqm. The first floor extension now proposed amounts to 90 sqm. This represents a cumulative increase of 101 sqm, which amounts to a 64.5% increase in the floor area of the dwelling. This is well in excess of the 30% limit in Policy H14 and therefore is considered to be a disproportionate addition to the dwelling. The proposal is therefore inappropriate development in the Green Belt which is harmful by definition and by reason of harm to openness. In accordance with the NPPF, this harm must be afforded significant weight.

It is noted that the applicant considers the increase in floor area to be only 34.5%. The difference between this and the figure quoted above is due to the way that the first floor roof void has been dealt with. The applicant's figures discount this from the calculations. However, it is considered that this area should be included, since the significant increase in the height of this part of the building impacts on the overall bulk and mass of the building and consequently on the openness of the Green Belt. Furthermore, a first floor could be added internally in this part of the building at a later date without the need for planning permission.

In any case, it is notable that the Inspector for the previous appeal relating to this site took account of the increase in the height and volume of the building as well as the increase in floorspace. It was the combination of the increase in floorspace and the increase in height and volume that led him to conclude that those previous proposals would amount to a disproportionate addition. In this regard it is notable that the proposed increase in ridge height remains similar in the current scheme, albeit the increase in eaves height has been reduced by 1.5m. Nevertheless, there remains a significant increase in the height and volume of the building, amounting to a whole additional floor of development.

For these reasons it has been concluded that the proposals amount to inappropriate development that would reduce the openness of the Green Belt. No very special circumstances have been presented which outweighs the conflict with Green Belt policy or the harm identified.

Impact on Neighbour Amenity

In terms of overlooking, the proposed first floor roof lights belonging to the bedrooms and bathrooms could be conditioned to be obscure glazed to prevent overlooking. Further rooflights are proposed to be installed in part of the roof as a light inlet to a vaulted ceiling. Given the significant height of these above floor level they would have no impact on the adjacent neighbours and, as such, the proposal would not result in material harm by reason of overlooking and loss of privacy.

The existing bungalow does breach the 45 degree guideline to windows belonging to nos. 16 and 18 Stoneleigh Close, however, both these neighbours have secondary light sources into the relevant rooms and the breach is a sufficient distance away. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal does not significantly impact on the adjacent neighbours so as to warrant a refusal based on harm to neighbouring amenity. The proposal is thus in accordance with Local Plan Policy BE3.

Summary/Conclusion

The proposal would constitute a 64.5% increase in the floor area of the house as originally built and would add a whole additional floor of development. It is therefore considered to result in disproportionate additions which are inappropriate within the Green Belt, harmful by definition, and by reason of harm to openness. The addition of the first floor will substantially increase the bulk and mass of the dwelling. Therefore the proposals are contrary to the NPPF and Local Plan Policies DS18 and H14.

REFUSAL REASONS

- 1 The application property is within the Green Belt, wherein the Planning Authority is concerned to ensure that the rural character of the area will be retained and protected in accordance with national policy guidance contained in the NPPF which states that the limited extension of existing dwellings in Green Belt areas may be appropriate provided that it does not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling. Policy H14 of the Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029 defines disproportionate as in excess of 30% of the floor area of the original dwelling.

The proposals would constitute a 64.5% addition to the floor area of the house as originally built and would add a whole additional floor of development. It is therefore considered to result in disproportionate additions which are inappropriate within the Green Belt, harmful by definition, and reducing the openness of the Green Belt.

It is considered that the proposed development would radically alter the scale and character of the original dwelling, thus constituting an undesirable extension and consolidation of a residential property likely to affect detrimentally the character of this rural locality, thereby constituting inappropriate development conflicting with the aims of Green Belt and Local Plan policy.

No very special circumstances have been presented which outweigh the

harm identified.
