



ARCHITECTURE

INTERIOR
DESIGN

PROJECT
MANAGEMENT

Justification statement in connection with proposed extensions to

Moorland Lea, Royd Moor Road

September 2023

REV A

Justification statements for extensions at Moorland Lea

In Clarification of what is achievable under the GPDO for this house on this site, taking the following into account;

- ✓ The house became a dwelling during the period of 1960 - 1990 with the domestic curtilage being established at the time of being built, the site plan outline shows the domestic curtilage of the existing dwelling.
- ✓ The house has all of its permitted development rights intact
- ✓ The house is not in a designated area AONB, conservation area or national park.
- ✓ The house is not a listed building.
- ✓ We are assuming a statutory 2.4m notional height for the eaves height for all the below volume calculations.

We are aware that under permitted development rights we would be allowed to implement on this property, are the following:

Class A extensions

Rear Extensions – Single Storey (North East Elevations)

- Rear Extension of up to 4 meters under the GPDO and 8 metres under Prior Approval (Neighbourhood Consultation scheme).
- As long as it is not within 2 metres of the boundary.
- The ridge heights and eaves heights do not increase past 2.4m and 4m respectively.

Side Extensions to the East & West elevations

Where it would extend beyond the 'side elevation' (East and West Elevations) of the original house, the extension:

- Could not exceed four metres in height.
- Can only be a single storey.
- Can only be up-to half the width of the original house. (5.5m)

Front Elevation

Where it would extend beyond the 'side elevation' (East and West Elevations) of the original house, the extension:

- Could not exceed four metres in height.
- Can only be a single storey.
- Can only be 3sqm in footprint

Class E of the GPDO

Outbuildings for the incidental enjoyment of the dwelling

- A double garage is proposed as part of the scheme that is attached to the house, though for this purpose we have illustrated a detached garage to comply with GPDO, but as our calculations show we could implement a much larger garage and other buildings such as swimming pool and home gym under GPDO within the curtilage as long as it conforms to the following:

1 – The eaves height and ridge height does not exceed 2.5m and 4 metres respectively.

2 –The size of the outbuildings does not exceed 50% of the total area of the domestic curtilage/site area.

3 – For clarification, the site area/domestic curtilage is **1916 sqm.**

4- under the GPDO there is no limit on distance between the main house and the proposed outbuildings.

Table 1 – indicative sizes permissible under GPDO

Extension/building description	Size in (sq Meters) External
Single storey Rear Extension (4 x 9.6m)	48sqm
Side extension (NWest)	35.57m2
Side extension (NEast)	40.12m2
Second storey (over original footprint of bungalow)	75sqm
Porch	3 sqm
Garage	40.3sqm
Outbuildings	50 sqm
<u>Total</u>	291.99sqm allowed under PD rules

Figure 1 – Indicative extensions permissible under GPDO.

Please see below the indicated extensions which could be achieved under the GPDO/ Neighbourhood Consultation scheme, and these do not even include what we could achieve within the garden of the property. It is worth considering we have received no objections that we are aware of to the scheme that has been proposed from any neighbours.

Table 2 – Proposed extension sizes of scheme for comparison. Eaves height for volume is 1.1m at the first-floor level as the eaves are proposed a lot lower than a full storey

Extension	Size in (sq Meters) External
First floor extension (eaves at 1.1m)	116m ²
Front elevation to create new front entrance 2 storey	16.4sqm
<u>Total development</u>	<u>132sqm²</u>
Garage Outbuilding with roof storage room	50 sqm
<u>Total development incl outbuildings</u>	<u>182sqm</u>

Conclusion

The proposed extensions put forward within this scheme fall well under the sqm which is achievable under the GPDO by the addition of extensions to front, rear, side elevations and the addition of a first floor storey allowed to the existing footprint of the bungalow as demonstrated earlier on in this document as shown in Table 1. The total sqm footprint that would be allowed is 291.99sqm (please

note though we have not taken this to the extreme further development could be achievable under the PD rules)

The scheme that we are proposing would add a further 132sqm in accommodation to the dwelling and a further 50sqm in garaging giving a total of 182sqm in development. This is a 39% reduction in what could be achieved under the PD and prior approval route.

As the bungalow stands now, the PD rights are still fully intact, though this would not be the case if the applicant had carried out the approved garage scheme 2022/0648, which they are not intending to.

In terms of the openness of the greenbelt the existing ridge height is lifted by approx. 1.5m, from the existing bungalow roof as it stands now under this application. Under the prior approval application that has been approved this ridge height has now been allowed to be taken up over 2.5m from the height of the ridge that stands now. This is a difference of 1.0m if the Prior approval scheme is built and this roof is 1m higher than what we are proposed under this current application.

The design of the proposed dwelling takes into account the heights of the ridge and has been designed to sit within the rural location it is set within, and as stated above is also lower than what could be carried out and built under the GPDO prior approval scheme. This prior approval grant of permission now further supports our proposed scheme on its potential harm caused to the openness of the green belt, i.e that it would cause less harm than what the GPDO overall scheme would, the materials that are proposed under this application are also far more in keeping with the surrounding buildings such as the stone farmhouse directly adjacent to the bungalow and with the old dairy opposite the bungalow that is a stone barn on the same site. Rather than the rendered bungalow The scheme is far superior and sympathetic than the previous approved applications and the newly approved prior approval scheme.

Non withstanding the above we would also like to draw your attention to the NPPF which states emphasis on the need to maximise land and the need to “make as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land” (NPPF chapter 13,137a). When considering the Dartford Case in relevant planning case law , during his summing up , Lord Justice Lewison (“Lewison LJ”) finding that the list of exclusions to the definition of “Previously Developed Land” in the NPPF is clear and reference to “land in built-up areas such as residential gardens” cannot sensibly be interpreted as including residential gardens not in built-up areas. It was therefore established that residential gardens in open countryside locations were “brownfield” and applications for development should be considered in light of that classification.

The proposals as forensically examined above with regards to their size which do not exceed the limits set out on the GPDO and therefore accord with the NPPF Chapter 13 145 c which states development is acceptable if the proposal is “the extension or alteration of a building providing it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building”. As there is no written percentage within the NPPF then the GPDO is a very reliable guide.

We feel that there are multiple precedents in this area for extensions much bigger than we are proposing. As the proposed extensions do not affect any of the neighbouring properties in this instance and the curtilage around the bungalow is substantial and all boundaries being able to

comply with the GPDO rules, we feel that the proposed scheme as it stands is acceptable and should be fully supported and considering what has been allowed under the prior approval scheme.