Robert Menzies Mount Pleasant Farm Well Lane Gillow Heath Stoke on Trent Staffordshire ST8 6QR

Wayne Johnson Staffordshire Moorlands District Council Moorlands House Stockwell Street Leek Staffordshire ST13 6HQ

Dear Mr Johnson

Appeal Ref: APP/B3438/A/14/2217581 Equestrian Building at Mount Pleasant farm, Well Lane, Gillow Heath, Staffordshire, ST8 6QR SMDC Ref: SMD/2013/1177

We submit this application via the Planning Portal to vary condition no 2 attached to planning permission SMD/2013/1177.

The submission is made in accordance with s73 of the Town and Country Planning Act. Planning Policy Guidance states that there is no statutory definition of a 'minor material amendment' but it is likely to include any amendments where its scale and/or nature results in a development which is not substantially different from the one which has been approved. This is the case here as recommended by yourself in place of the Non Material Amendment NMA/2015/006 previously submitted.

The original consent granted approval for a new dwelling at Mount Pleasant Farm in the place of a former equestrian building.

This proposal seeks minor changes to the position/size of a couple of windows and location/size of roof windows to fall in line with manufacturers standards. In addition an increase to the ridge of height of approximately one brick coupled with the reduction in the eaves height and porch canopy by the same. This will provide an adjustment to the angle of the roof pitch to accommodate the Staffordshire Blue Tiles approved by the LPA under the discharge of conditions and in doing so gives further benefits to the scheme in the form of a reduction, albeit small, to the overall bulk of the building achieving less impact to the Green Belt.

The Proposal

The revised plans seek slight changes to the external appearance the building by proposing alternative openings that relate closely in area and location to the ones currently approved.

There are very minor changes to the massing/scale of the building providing an overall reduction in bulk; the approved materials for the roof and walls remains unchanged; the increase in height of the roof would be minimal but is coupled with a reduction in the eaves and porch canopy height.

In summary the changes to openings are:

Elevation A: The relocation of a rooflight from the dressing room to bathroom, slight movement of WC window and bathroom window. Slight resizing of rooflights in accordance with manufacturers standards.

Elevation B: The removal of one very large window/door, and change of second large window/door to bifold door extending to the corner of the building.

Elevation C: Bifold doors to extend into the corner of the building.

Elevation D: Resize/ change of shape to Master Bedroom Window.

The principle of new property has been accepted by the approval of planning permission SMD/2013/1177. The revised plans seek changes to the external appearance to slightly change the number and design of the approved openings and to slightly alter the pitch of the roof.

None of the changes to the windows/doors would have an adverse impact on residential amenity.

It is considered that there would be no material planning impact as a result of the proposed amendments for the development.

The reduction of the overall building bulk would provide further benefits to openness of the green belt.

Revised wording of Condition 2

Condition 2 on the planning permission states:

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: AB-ST-PL-01, AB-ST-PL-02, AB-STPL-03, AB-ST-PL-04 and AB-ST-PL-05.

We suggest the following wording

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: AB-ST-PL-01 rev 1, AB-ST-PL-02 rev 1, AB-PL-03 rev 1, AB-PL-04 rev 1 and AB-PL-05 rev 1.

General

It should be noted that Conditions 3 and 4 on the original consent are now discharged and therefore there is no need to repeat them on a new decision notice, should permission be granted.

It is considered that the changes would not result in any adverse impacts on amenity and provide positive contribution to the openness of the greenbelt, therefore we see no reason to refuse a variation of the condition.

If you have any queries concerning this application, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards

Rob Menzies