The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2017

by Jameson Bridgwater PGDipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 24th March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/B3438/D/17/3167769
27 Chestnut Walk, Cheddleton ST13 7BJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs P Wood against the decision of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council.
- The application Ref SMD/2016/0481 was refused by notice dated 31 October 2016.
- The development proposed is described as 'proposed first floor extension above existing garage and a additional window at first floor on the rear elevation'.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

2. The appeal site is within the Green Belt and so the main issues are:

   - Whether the proposal would be inappropriate development for the purposes of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework); and
   - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a substantial detached dwelling that is located on a modern planned estate in the Green Belt. The area is characterised by large detached dwellings set in spacious plots. The key architectural features that characterise Chestnut Walk are the combination of the projecting front facing two-storey gables and the integral garages that are generally single storey in nature, with a mono-pitched roof. It is proposed to erect a first floor extension above the existing garage at the front of the property.

Whether inappropriate development?

4. Policies R1 and SS6c of the Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy set out Green Belt policy. Paragraph 89 of the Framework allows the extension or alteration of a building within the Green Belt provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original dwelling.

5. The original dwelling has a footprint of approximately 192.7m^2. Further, the appellants have confirmed that the floor area of their conservatory is around 12.9m^2. The proposed first floor extension would result in an increase in floorspace in the order of 22.2m^2. Which when added to the conservatory

amounts to a cumulative increase in floorspace of 35.1m^2. This would result in a percentage increase in floorspace of approximately 18.5% over and above the original dwelling. Moreover, given the location and size of the extension in relation to the host dwelling, it would not have the effect of materially reducing the openness of the Green Belt. Consequently, when comparing the original dwelling to the one that would result if the proposal were to go ahead, the outcome would not be disproportionate. It would therefore not be inappropriate development which is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt.

6. Therefore the proposed first floor extension would not conflict with Policies R1 and SS6c of the Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy.

Character and appearance

7. I have carefully considered the appellants' representations in relation to scale, form and massing of the proposed extension. However, the proposed extension would visually dominate the original two-storey projecting front facing gable of the host dwelling and would result in the loss of the single-storey mono-pitched garage roof. These are both key architectural features that make a positive and unifying contribution to both the host dwelling and the street scene. Consequently, the proposed first floor extension would appear incongruous in the context of the host dwelling and the street scene. This conclusion is not altered by the proposed use of a matching palette of materials.

8. Having reached the conclusions above the proposed first floor extension would result in material harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. Therefore, the proposal would conflict with Policy DC1 of the Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy that seeks amongst other things to ensure that development is designed to respect the site and its surroundings and promote a positive sense of place and identity.

Conclusion

9. I have found that the proposed first floor extension would not be disproportionate and therefore would not be inappropriate development which is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt. However, it would result in material harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

10. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Jameson Bridgwater

INSPECTOR