DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2017/0244 **Valid 12/04/2017**	**FERNBANK REACLIFFE ROAD RUDYARD**	**ERECTION OF FRONT EXTENSION INCLUDING NEW DUAL PITCHED ROOF OVER DWELLING FOLLOWING PARTIAL DEMOLITION AND ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING ELEVATIONS.** **(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)**

MAIN ISSUES

- Would the proposed development be inappropriate in the GreenBelt and if so would there be any other harm to the Green Belt?
- Would the design, character and appearance of the proposed development be acceptable in terms of its impact on the host dwelling and the appearance of the landscape and locality?
- Any impact on residential amenity?

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The existing dwelling is on the high ground above Reacliffe Road and the shore line of Rudyard Lake to the east. The plot forms a clearing or opening in the woods. The dwelling and its neighbours that are dotted around to the front and rear were originally circa 1920 holiday cabins. All of the neighbouring properties are brick built bungalows that have replaced the original cabins. The original timber cabin at Fernbank remains but it has been extended with a flat roof extension along the side and rear elevations. The single storey cabin is perched on steeply sloping ground with the single storey flat roof extension to the rear and supporting brick work structure underneath where the ground slopes away.

The dwelling at Fernbank is not apparent from Reacliffe Road below, but it can be seen from the neighbouring properties to the rear and just below to the front, glimpses of it are also available from the higher rising ground to the south.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is to run a new roof line up from the brick extension at the back that would form a ridge before running down with a cat slide roof over a replacement for the timber cabin part and the supporting structure underneath to create a split level dwelling that runs with the fall in the slope with single storey accommodation on the high ground to the rear and two storey as the land falls away to the front.

A flat roof dormer would run across the width of the front roof slope with a cut away sunken balcony beneath and behind the roof slope.

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
SS6c Other Rural Areas – Green Belt
DC1 Design Considerations
DC3 Landscape

National Planning Policy Framework

Green Belt
Paragraph(s) 79-89

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

Timber holiday chalet was present at the time of the 1925 Ordnance Survey.

Not exactly clear when but at some point that, judging by style and condition of brickwork and fenestration, was probably post 1948 the chalet was extended. A flat roof side extension was added down the width of the western side elevation and two adjoining outbuildings were replaced with a flat roof brick extension across the rear elevation.

It is apparent (from the Right Move sales particulars) that the previous occupier and owner had for many years occupied it as a dwelling house and their main and sole residence.

SMD/2016/0724 – Side extension to dwelling. Refused.

SMD/2016/0082 – Certificate of lawfulness for proposed detached outbuilding. Refused.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 7/06/2017
Neighbour consultation period ends: 7/06/2017

The neighbours to the rear and west of the property were not sent a letter of notification. The case officer made a visit personally to the property owners at The Laurels and Braeside to ensure that they were aware of the proposal and had an opportunity to comment.

Public Comments

1 Letter of support received from a neighbour who believes that the proposed development will enhance the area.

Town / Parish Comments

Horton Parish Council – Unanimous support

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

Is the proposal inappropriate development in the Green Belt?

The dwelling is in the Green Belt. New building work 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" or "the replacement of an existing building providing the new building is in the same use and is not materially larger".

The original building in this case was a small, single floor, timber holiday chalet with a sun veranda. A 1925 OS map shows that the chalet, at that time, had a footprint of approximately 72 sq. m and that in all probability remained so up to and beyond 1948. The definition in the NPPF confirms that the 'original building' should be regarded as the extent of the building as built in 1948 – in this case therefore, this is likely to have been how it had also existed in 1925.

It is not exactly clear when but, judging by the condition and style of the extensions, most likely after 1948 a side extension was added to the western elevation and two adjoining outbuildings were replaced with a brick extension across the rear. According to the applicant's consultant this added another 33sq.m. to footprint and a percentage increase of approximately 45% (my own calculations do not differ significantly to these figures).

A previous proposal to extend the dwelling to the side would have added a further 34sq.m. – in total the footprint would be increased by some 60-70 sq. m, in effect doubling the size of the original building. That proposal was withdrawn before planning permission was refused.

This current proposal will use existing footprint consolidating original floor area and its extensions under one new roof profile. The proposal improves and adds to the available accommodation by: making very minor roof height increases with a new roof ridge and a dormer roof arrangement that retains low profile and massing; allowing the more efficient reconfiguration of floor space with a new replacement structure and roof profile; and replacing the previously wasted mass and volume of the supporting brick structure with ground floor accommodation in a new split level arrangement that works with the slope of the ground. All of this is achieved without

making any notable additions to the footprint or massing of the existing building and as such, there is no disproportionate extension proposed and the extent to which the development replaces the existing building does so without becoming materially larger. The proposed development is therefore, not inappropriate within the Green Belt.

Compliant with Green Belt Policy – no identifiable harm to the Green Belt.

Design and Appearance

The history of the largely small bungalow properties on the Lake side and in Reacliffe woods is that of replacements for timber holiday chalets that were introduced and popular in the 1920s. At Fernbank the original timber holiday chalet remains in tact and is very apparent, particularly when viewed from the front, albeit it has a flat roof extension across the back and to one side

It is considered that there is some merit in retaining and replicating the simple form and character of the timber chalet, as being appropriate to its Green Belt, Woodland and lakeside setting and faithful to a certain historical integrity, rather than taking on the suburban form and character of a more conventional brick dwelling or bungalow. With this proposal, this has been achieved by retaining the same orientation and proportions with large full length glazing with vertical glazing bars across the front and by using an interesting pallet of materials including natural stone, replica timber fibre panelling, and grey aluminium glazing bars.

The roof arrangement to create the split level accommodation that runs with the slope of the ground will to the front create a rather long expanse of roof tile but this is broken up with a fully glazed flat roof dormer that will balance with and repeat the ground floor glazing below. A cutaway balcony sunken into the roof slope to the front of the dormer will have the effect of revealing and increasing the proportion of visible dormer glazing and improve its balance with the full height glazing below.

Compliant with Design Policies DC1 and DC3 of the Core Strategy.

Amenity

Fernbank does have neighbouring properties to the front and below some 60 metres away. The proposed balcony and windows will have the same outlook as the front windows of the existing chalet which does incorporate a glazed veranda to the front.

No additional impact.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

No Green Belt Harm
Good Design

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : APPROVE

Case Officer: Ben Hurst
Recommendation Date: 07/06/2017

X B.J. Haywood

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council