DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2016/0502	**BIG SOUTHLOWE FARM**	**PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY**
Valid 11/08/2016	**LEEK ROAD**	**REAR EXTENSION**
	CELLARHEAD	
		(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Is the proposal inappropriate development in the Green Belt?
- Would the proposal harm openness or result in any other harm to the Green Belt?
- Design and Appearance
- Residential amenity of neighbours

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The property is in a row of four large detached dwellings that form a linear grouping with a strong road side frontage to Leek Road. The dwelling and the neighbour on either side have relatively long and wide rear garden plots that are pan flat between north and south and west and east and there is no notable step in levels between properties or the field to the rear. There is a 1.8 metre high fence on the dwelling's northern boundary and a dense conifer hedge on its southern. There is 2 metres between the dwelling and the side of the house to the north while to the south there is a wider gap of 8 or 9 metres between houses.

The dwelling and its neighbour on each side are, all three, in the Green Belt just the other side of the Werrington settlement boundary, which runs along the back edge of the properties fronting Heath Avenue. Their gardens have an open aspect on to grazing land to the west and aspect is maximised with a post and rail fence to rear. The grazing land's southern boundary coincides with the settlement boundary and the back of the houses along Heath Avenue, these properties have a variety of flat roof and conservatory type rear extensions.

PROPOSAL

Single storey rear extension would be built onto the back of the main living room to form a sun lounge. Parapet walls with a central roof lantern. Matching red brick with stone quoins. Extension would be closest to neighbour to the north with flank elevation 1.5 – 2m from the boundary fence.

4 metre projection and eaves just less than 3 metre in height – extension would be permitted by GPDO 2015 if it were not for a condition of the dwelling's planning permission that removed those rights.

Plans have been amended to introduce large French window on rear elevation and vertical glazing bars on side window while reducing its drop.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Adopted 2014)

S01 Spatial Objectives
SS1 Development Principles
SS1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
DC1 Design Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework

Green Belt

Paragraph(s) 79 - 89

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

SMD/2012/0607 – Replacement of stone farm house and barn with two detached dwellings. Approved 07.09.2012.

The dwelling is in the Green Belt it was built as one of a pair that replaced a stone farm house and a barn.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 15/09/2016
Neighbour consultation period ends: 09/09/16
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

One letter of objection has been received from the adjacent neighbour to the north.

The neighbour is concerned about:

- Overshadowing of property
- Impact on views from property
- Concerned about noise and light nuisance and loss of privacy because of the large glass roof lantern.
- If approved could time limits be placed on working days.

Town / Parish Comments

None Received

OFFICER COMMENTS

Is the proposal inappropriate development in the Green Belt?

The dwelling is in the Green Belt but the extension would not be inappropriate. New buildings should be regarded as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are listed at para. 89 of the NPPF and one of those exceptions include the "extension….of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building". The original building is a relatively large 4 bed house with a wide frontage. The extension would be a very subordinate single storey addition providing a modest sun lounge that would normally be permitted development and would increase the dwelling's ground floor footprint by less than 25 %. The extension therefore, would not be a disproportionate addition and would not be inappropriate.

Would the proposal harm openness or result in any other harm to the Green Belt?

Para. 79 of the Framework states that the fundamental aim of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The extension would have a footprint that would inevitably consume an open area of land that is currently free from any other built form. However, this does not automatically mean that it would be 'harmful' to Green Belt openness. With consideration of its context and adopting a 'holistic' approach to the Green Belt, the extension would have a very close subordinate relationship with the original building and moreover, against the back drop of the large detached dwellings, viewed as a closely arranged pair, its impact on openness is, overall, inconsequential. It is therefore concluded that the development would not adversely affect the openness of the Green Belt. Moreover, the extension would sit within the closely associated apron of the dwelling within the residential enclosure of its curtilage, it does not extend or protrude beyond these confines and as such, there is no harm to the Green Belt by reason of encroachment.

Design and Appearance

Extension would be in keeping. Matching brick and stone quoins. Parapet wall and central roof lantern. Amended plan gives vertical orientation to rear window introducing full length French window and vertical glazing bars in side window while reducing its drop. No adverse impact on character and appearance of area – neighbour to the south has a glazed conservatory and backs of houses along Heath avenue have a range of flat roof extensions and conservatories.

Residential amenity of neighbours

It is worth noting that if the rights conveyed by Part 1 of the GPDO had not been removed by condition then this extension would be permitted development and issues of amenity would not fall to be considered. This type of condition should only be attached in exceptional circumstances, and although it is not explicitly stated, it is fair to assume that, in this case, the only 'exceptional circumstance' is the Green Belt allocation and therefore, the only reason for the condition is to protect the openness of the Green Belt rather than to bring additional protection for neighbouring amenity. In any event all amenity issues are considered in full below.

Extension would be closest to the neighbour to the north. While the neighbour raises concerns over overshadowing and loss of view, a 45 degree line from centre of neighbour's large patio window would not breached and this, in conventional assessment, is a strong indication that the impact of the extension would not be unreasonable. Moreover, there is a strong 2 metre high close boarded fence between the two properties.

The neighbour to the north is concerned that the roof lantern will impact on privacy and cause light and noise nuisance, he suggests that obscure glass should be used. The roof lantern is a high level sky light offering views only upwards into the open sky from the habitants some distance below. The angles and distances between habitants, on the ground floor, and the roof light above, provide absolutely no opportunity for the overlooking of the neighbour's property, there is no justification to insist on obscure glazing. The light and noise that may emanate from the lantern will be no greater than the light or sound from any other window in the property. The plans do not show any openings in the lantern it appears to be fixed glazing panels, however, even if there were to be some openings they would be merely for ventilation purposes and would not increase outlook.

The windows to the side of the extension would face toward the adjacent garden to the south. The garden boundary would be approx. 8metres away from the windows. The impact of the windows would have a similar impact to the glazed side wall of say a conventional conservatory. The boundary has a coniferous hedge of 1.5m – 1.8m, at 8 metres from this boundary there should be no views over or into the garden beyond and the hedge forms an adequate screen. Moreover, if required a fence of up to 2m could be erected to increase screening or the hedge could be maintained at a greater height.

It has also been suggested that limits are places on the times at which the builders can carry out the work. But this is a modest brick extension of relatively simple build it is not a large project that will run into many months of disruption. If builders choose to work at the weekend for example this will be balanced by a shortening of the construction time frame. It is not considered appropriate to place this type of condition on a build of this nature.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

Planning Permission should be granted. The Extension would not be inappropriate development in the Green belt, it would not harm the openness of the greenbelt or cause encroachment. There are no other reasons to refuse planning permission.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION :

Case Officer: Ben Hurst
Recommendation Date: 7.10.16

X B.J. Haywood

Signed by: Haywood, Ben

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council