DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2017/0523 **Valid 23/08/2017**	**RED RIDGE CLEWLOWS BANK** **STOCKTON BROOK**	**PROPOSED REAR EXTENSION,RAISING RIDGE TO ACCOMMODATE ROOMS IN ROOF SPACE** **(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)**

MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of development (inc. Green Belt consideration)
- Design/impact on the street-scene and the character & appearance of the area
- Impact on residential amenity
- Highway safety
- Sustainability

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The property to which the application relates is a detached bungalow constructed of rendered elevations under a tiled roof with gardens to front and rear. The property is set back from the road at a higher level due to the land rising from the road. The site is located on the eastern side of Clewlows Bank, Stockton Brook, towards the southern end of a short ribbon of development. To the west and east is open countryside/Green Belt with Stanley Pool not far beyond the eastern boundary. A Public Right Of Way (Bagnall) also runs past the eastern boundary of the site.

The site lies within the Green Belt and Staffordshire Moorlands Special Landscape Area, as defined in the Development Plan.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks full planning permission for proposed rear extension, raising ridge to accommodate rooms in roof space.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES, GUIDANCE AND OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Adopted 2014)

S01 Spatial Objectives
SS1 Development Principles
SS1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
SS6 Rural Areas
SS6b Smaller Villages Area Strategy

SS6c Other Rural Areas
DC1 Design Considerations
DC3 Landscape and Settlement Setting
C1 Creating Sustainable Communities
T1 Development and Sustainable Transport
R1 Rural Diversification
R2 Rural Housing

SPD - Design Principles for Development in Staffordshire Moorlands

National Planning Policy Framework

- Ministerial foreword
- Introduction (Inc. Achieving sustainable development, presumption in favour of sustainable development, core planning principles, delivering sustainable development)
- 1 Building a strong, competitive economy
- 4 Promoting sustainable transport
- 7 Requiring good design
- 9 Protecting Green belt land
- 10 Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

National Planning Practice Guidance

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

SMD/2006/0764 – Rear extension and conservatory. Approved, 01.09.2006. It is noted that the 'rear extension' has been implemented but the 'conservatory' has not been implemented.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 13.10.2017
Neighbour consultation period ends: 06.10.2017
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

None received.

Town / Parish Comments

None received.

SCC Highways

No objections.

Severn Trent Water

As the proposal has minimal impact on the public sewerage system it is advised that STW has no objections to the proposals and do not require a drainage condition to be applied.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development (Inc. Green Belt issues)

As noted above, the application seeks full planning permission for a rear extension and to raise the roof ridge in order to accommodate rooms in the roof space.

The NPPF states that new buildings in the Green Belt are inappropriate development, which is harmful by definition, and such applications should be refused unless there are very special circumstances to overcome the identified harm. There are exceptions to the general rule of new buildings being inappropriate development, one of which is

> *"the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building."*

Hence, the proposed extension and alteration could be acceptable in principle provided such changes do not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.

From Council records (previous application) and current plans, the comparative sizes are as noted in Table 1 below.

Table 1

(Figures are approx. within 1 or 2 % points)	Original Dwelling	Previous Extensions Implemented (2006) & Total	Current Proposed Extensions & Total	Total Increase Over Original
Footprint	75sqm	26sqm/101sqm	23sqm/124sqm	49sqm (66%)
Floor Area	75sqm	26sqm/101sqm	127sqm/228sqm	153sqm (204%)
Max Height	5.3m	5.3m	6m	0.7m (13%)
Max Width	9.4m	9.4m	9.4m	0
Max Depth	7.8m	10.8m/3m	14.4m to 11.1m	6.6m to 3.3 (84% to 42%)

From the figures outlined in Table 1 above it can be seen that the proposed extensions and alterations would result in the following increases over the size of the original dwelling: a) Footprint - 66%; b) Floor Area – 204% (noting that the original dwelling had no habitable floor area in the roof space and that it is only as a result of applying to raise the ridge height within the current application that a habitable floor area becomes feasible in the roof space); c) Height – 13% and d) Depth – varying between 84% and 42%. The volume and mass of the resultant building would also

increase significantly over and above the original building. Given these increases in size over the original it is concluded that the proposed extensions would result in disproportionate additions to the property over and above the size of the original dwelling. Consequently, the proposed extensions and alterations constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The extent of the extensions is considered to reduce the openness of the Green Belt, encroach into it and consequently threaten its permanence. There are no very special circumstances which overcome the harm identified.

It is noted that the previous permission (SMD/2006/0764) included a single-storey conservatory which has not yet been implemented, but which could still be implemented (as the works that have been undertaken thus far means that the permission has started). The approved conservatory had a footprint of approx. 3m x 3.8m. The current proposed single-storey rear extension has a footprint of approx. 3.3m x 5.8m. It is acknowledged that his element of the proposals in itself would not result in the overall extent of extensions being significantly different to the previously approved scheme. However, raising the roof and extending the property at 'first-floor' level, which enables an additional habitable floor level to be incorporated into the building, extends the property to a level which in totality results in the extensions constituting disproportionate additions over and above the original dwelling. The conservatory which has approval and could be implemented is considered not to constitute very special circumstances which outweigh the harm identified.

In addition, the raising of the roof creates a ratio of roof to wall which is disproportionate whilst the addition of the gables create a bulky and dominant appearance to the rear elevation. Consequently, the proposal results in an addition which is visually disproportionate as well as disproportionate in purely mathematical and volumetric terms. Concerns regarding the design and appearance are returned to in more detail as a separate issue below.

Stockton Brook is identified as one of the 'smaller villages' in policy SS6b of the CS (Smaller Villages Area Strategy). Policy SS6c of the CS (Other Rural Areas Strategy) covers other rural areas in the countryside and green belt outside of the development and infill boundaries. The application site is located on the outskirts of Stockton Brook within the Green Belt and Countryside. The policy seeks to meet essential local needs by allowing for certain forms of development, including extensions to building (in accordance with policies R1 and R2 as necessary). The quality of the countryside is to be enhanced and/or conserved by, amongst other things, requiring development proposals to respect and respond positively to the distinctive qualities of the surrounding landscape. The policy also seeks to maintain the Green Belt (subject to any detailed boundary review). The policy states that

> *"Strict control will continue to be exercised over inappropriate development within the Green Belt allowing only for exceptions as defined by Government policy."*

Bearing in mind the above, the principle of the proposed development is not acceptable and does not accord with policy SS6c of the CS or section 9 of the NPPF. As such the application should be refused.

Design/impact on the street-scene and character & appearance of the area

The proposed extension is located on the eastern, rear elevation of the existing dwelling. The depth of the extension at ground-floor level, over the existing (not original) primarily relates to the single-storey rear extension, which is approx. 3.3m. The max. height of the single-storey element is approx. 4.2m. At 'first-floor' level the max. depth of the extension is approx. 7.2m (measured from the existing ridge to the rear elevation of the proposed upper-floor extension). The height of the roof ridge increases by approx. 0.7m in height. The width of the building remains the same.

With reference to the previously approved floor plans (as the submitted existing floor-plans do not denote the rooms), the property has a lounge, hall, bathroom, kitchen/dinning room and 3 No. bedrooms (x 1 No. with an en-suite). The proposed floor plans show that the resultant property would provide a larger kitchen/dinning area and additional 'lounge' at ground-floor level, the removal of a bedroom (the smallest) from the ground-floor and the introduction of 2 No. bedrooms (1 No. with a bathroom and the other with an en-suite) at first-floor level. Hence, in effect the resultant property with have 4 No. bedrooms and 4 No. bathrooms. The use of an additional space within the roof, which is accessed via a door off the landing, is not denoted on the plans but is likely to be used as storage.

The design is such that the roofline of the proposed upper-floor extension at the rear has 3 No. ridges and 2 No. valley gulleys; the height of the valley gulleys is higher than the eaves heights of both the proposed upper-floor extension and the existing dwelling. The fenestration on the extension (3 No. windows) is placed on the rear elevation. The proposed materials are all to match existing (walls and roofs).

The application dwelling is located such that the extensions at the rear would be visible from the Public Right Of Way that passes the rear of the site and the rear gardens of neighbouring properties.

Policy SS1 of the Core Strategy (CS) seeks, amongst other things, to ensure that all development contributes positively to the Staffordshire Moorlands environment, maintaining the distinctive character of the Moorlands and its individual towns, villages and their settings.

Policy DC1 of the CS seeks to ensure that all development is well designed and reinforces local distinctiveness. New development should be of a high quality, respect the site and its surroundings and promote a positive sense of place and identity through (amongst other things) the scale, siting, character and appearance.

Policy DC3 of the CS seeks to protect or enhance the local landscape by, amongst other things, resisting development that would harm the character of the local or wider landscape.

Policy R2 of the CS allows for certain forms of housing development in rural areas, including extensions to existing dwellings

> *"…provided they are appropriate in scale and design and do not have a detrimental impact on the existing dwelling and the character of the rural area."*

The ‘Design Principles for Development in Staffordshire Moorlands’ SPD includes guidance on extensions to dwellings. Section 2, Roof Design’, states that traditional dwellings in the Moorlands have a simple dominant roof line.

Section 7 of the NPPF relates to ‘requiring good design’. Para 58 states that

> *“planning policies and decisions should aim to ensure that developments [amongst other things] are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping.”*

It is considered that the design of the upper-floor rear extension is such that the ‘zig zagging’ roof line, 3 No. gables, upper-floor extension and varying eaves heights would all draw the eye to the property and the disjointed design of the raised roof and upper-floor extension. The proposed roofing at the rear certainly isn’t ‘simple’ in design. As such, the design of this element of the proposal is out of keeping with both the host dwelling (as it currently is) and the original dwelling as it was. The proposed roof form would appear incongruous and out of character (even though there is a variation of roof styles on properties within the vicinity of the site). Bearing in mind the figures referred to above in the section covering Green Belt, it is considered that the proposed extensions are out of scale with the host property.

Consequently, it is considered that the proposed development does not comply with CS policies SS1, DC1, DC3 and R2, the SPD on Residential Design and section 7 of the NPPF. For these reasons the application should be refused.

Impact on residential amenity

Firstly, it is noted that the properties immediately to the south and north of the application dwelling are in effect two-storey dwellings. It is also noted that the property to the south is currently being extended and renovated. Having been on to both neighbouring sites and clarified which windows serve which rooms it is considered that the proposed extensions would not have any detrimental impact on the amenities of either of the immediate neighbouring properties.

As such, the proposal accords with the amenity tenets of policy DC1 of the CS and bullet point 4 of para. 17 of the NPPF.

Highway Safety

The proposed extensions and alterations would result in the dwelling having 4 No. bedrooms overall (compared with the existing 3 No.). However, the Highway Authority raises no objections. Bearing this in mind, in this instance, it is considered that there are no highway safety issues arising from the proposed development that would warrant a refusal. Therefore the proposal complies with Local Plan policy T1 and section 4 of the NPPF.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE/SUSTAINABILITY

Bearing all the above matters in mind the proposed development is considered to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt that would impact on the openness of

the Green Belt and encroach into it; there are no very special circumstances that outweigh the harm identified. The design of the proposed development, particularly the upper-floor section, is considered to be out of keeping with the host dwelling and therefore detrimental to the character of the area. As such the proposed is considered to be an unsustainable form of development which does not accord with Core Strategy policies SS1, SS1a, C1, SS6c, DC1, DC3, R2, the SPD 'Design Principles for Development in Staffordshire Moorlands' or sections 7 and 9 of the NPPF nor the sustainability thread running through the NPPF. The very minor economic and social benefits that would arise from the application do not outweigh the harm identified. Therefore it is recommended the application be refused.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Refuse

Case Officer: John Williamson
Recommendation Date: 16/10/2017

X B.J. Haywood

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council