

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2017/0007
Valid 05/01/2017

SHRUBBERY COTTAGE
CHEADLE ROAD
CHEDDLETON

ERECTION OF A CARPORT
(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 original dwelling is a 19th Century Stone Cottage that backs onto a much greater ground level behind. To the rear there is open meadow between the cottage and the Cheadle Road and the front has open aspect over farm land with hedgerow and tree lined boundaries. For many years the cottage stood in a dilapidated state without a roof structure. In 2008 the cottage was renovated and granted planning permission to be reused as a holiday let. In 2015 planning permission was granted to lift the occupancy condition so that it could be used as a dwelling. With permission an adjacent and abutting block and sheet shed was replaced to provide a new stone habitable link that joined it to two joining stone outbuildings that were converted into habitable accommodation.

There now exists a rather long and disjointed range of attached built form. That backs against the edge of the site.

PROPOSAL

The ground level surrounding the gable end of the cottage has already been dug out and retained with gabion walls. The proposal is to build on and attach to the end of the cottage's original gable an open timber framed car port.

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
SS6 Rural Areas
SS6c Other Rural Area Strategy
DC1 Design Considerations
DC2 Heritage

DC3 Landscape Character

National Planning Policy Framework

Paragraph(s) 79 – 89 'Green Belt'

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

SMD/2008/0908 Change of Use to Derelict Dwelling to Holiday Accommodation.
Approved 12/02/09.

SMD/2013/0745 Removal of Occupancy Restriction to be used as Dwelling.
Approved 31/07/13.

SMD/2015/0611 Replacement dwelling. Refused 12/06/2015.

SMD/2015/0611 Extensions, replacement of shed, & conversion of outbuilding.
Approved 1/02/16

SMD/2016/0353 Retention of shed containing biomass boiler. Approved 16/08/16.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 17/02/17
Neighbour consultation period ends: 27/01/17

Public Comments:

None

Town / Parish Comments:

Cheddleton Parish Council: OBJECT MOST STRONGLY Overdevelopment and Inappropriate Development in the Green Belt. The Council must question the amount and extent of the development that has been previously allowed on this original small cottage as it doubles the size of the original cottage?

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

Is the proposal inappropriate development in the Green Belt?

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". It is necessary therefore to make an assessment as to what constitutes original building and to what extent it

has already been and will be extended to determine whether the proposed development would result in disproportionate extension and be inappropriate.

'Original building' is defined in the NPPF as the building that existing pre 1948 or in the case of a building built after that date, the building as originally built.

The Stone cottage had for many years been in a state of dilapidation – essentially a shell without a roof. Following renovations and a 2008 change of use planning permission to reinstate the abandoned 19th Century cottage, the double fronted cottage with its pre 1948 single storey attachment (together forming the habitable accommodation) abutted a concrete block and profile sheet shed that had its own structural integrity and superficially joined the physical form to some stone outbuildings.

When an application was submitted in 2015 to carry out rear extensions to the cottage, replace the abutting shed with a habitable link and to use and convert the outbuildings to habitable accommodation, the case officer took "the existing development, including the outbuildings" to be the original building for the purposes of calculating whether additions would be disproportionate. He divided the footprint of proposed additions by the total footprint of the cottage and the outbuildings to conclude that there would be 30% increase that would not be disproportionate.

With this current application for the carport the applicant's agent has taken a similar approach to the previous case officer but instead used volume calculations to divide volume of additions, including that of the carport, by the total volume of cottage and outbuildings to demonstrate that the carport would result in an increase of just 17.2 % - an assessment against volume favours the applicant because the range of single storey elements, counted as original, have relatively high eaves and steep roof pitches while the existing extensions are largely single storey with low profiles.

'Disproportionate' is not defined and there is no guide or rule fixed to such an assessment. Percentages can assist and provide an evidence base but every case should be assessed on its own merits. In this case, where the building's impact on Green Belt is imposed most notably by its sprawling linear run of largely single storey form I consider that in this case it is most appropriate to use footprint rather than volume when calculating percentage increase to assist an assessment of proportionality. Using the approach of the previous case officer in terms of what constitutes original building, my calcs show that additions when assessed against footprint would, with the car port, be up to about 46%.

However, in my view the 'original building' both as existing pre 1948 and then as built with the renovations under the 2008 planning permission, amounts and is limited to the two storey double fronted cottage and its single storey attachment. The block and profile sheet shed and the outbuildings beyond were different separate buildings, with their own structural integrity and discrete interior spaces (photographic records show this) . These separate buildings just happened to have a side wall that abutted the exterior side wall of the cottage's single storey element.

The work that was proposed in the 2015 planning app extended the 'original building' (the stone cottage) by replacing the concrete block shed with a habitable link to the

stone outbuildings that were converted and reused to provide living accommodation. This work has extended the original building disproportionately, the buildings now provide internal living space that runs through and is integral to the cottage. However, in my assessment, these disproportionate extensions were not inappropriate development because they consisted of the replacement of a building where the replacement was not materially larger and the conversion and reuse of an existing building – both exemptions at paras. 89 & 90.

The original building (the cottage) therefore, has already been disproportionately extended and now has a rangy stretched linear form. Taking the outbuildings out of the equation and just looking at the extent to which the footprint of the cottage has already been increased to the rear – existing additions amount to a 55% increase and with the carport the original footprint would be increased by 94%.

Obviously if the extent to which the cottage has been extended by virtue of replacement and converted outbuildings are brought into the assessment the footprint of the original cottage has already been extended quite dramatically and this would weigh even further against the car port proposal or indeed any other extension or addition.

The proposed development therefore would be a disproportionate addition to the original dwelling and would be inappropriate development which would by definition be harmful to the Green Belt. The NPPF makes it clear that substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt.

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

The extension would have a footprint that would inevitably consume an open area of land that is currently free from any other built form. This area of land has been created by digging out the ground to the side and around the end of the dwelling's gable. While the car port would be surrounded on three sides, by retained land and the gable wall, and this would restrict views of it from any where but the front, there would be some harm to the openness of the green belt because the sprawling train of buildings and structures would be further prolonged increasing the expanse of resultant footprint and width of built form.

The development would harm the openness of the Green Belt. Paragraph 79 of the NPPF states that the fundamental aim of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. There is a significant 150 metre wide gap of open, largely undeveloped agricultural land between 340 Cheadle Road to the north and 366 Cheadle Road to the south. The property at Shrubbery Cottage lies within this gap and has a long linear chain of structure that stretches between north and south. The development would further prolong the footprint and width of built form that would expand within and creep closer to closing that gap of undeveloped land thereby increasing its harmful impact on the openness of the Green Belt. The development would be at odds with a fundamental aim of the Green Belt identified at Paragraph 79 of the NPPF.

Design

The original dwelling is a 19th Century stone cottage that makes an established and positive contribution to the character and appearance of the local and historic landscape. The development would attach to the end gable of the original dwelling prolonging the rangy, disjointed train of built form. The character and appearance of the original 19th Century stone cottage, which would be sandwiched between recent additions on both sides, would become increasingly lost to the detriment of the character and appearance of the landscape. As such the development would contravene Policies DC1, DC2 and DC3 of the Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy.

Amenity

There would be no adverse impacts.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

There are no other considerations that would amount to very special circumstances and clearly outweigh the identified harm to the green belt. Planning permission should be refused.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : Refuse

Case Officer: Ben Hurst

Recommendation Date: 21st February 2017

X *B.J. Haywood*

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council