Re-submission of /09/00019/FUL
Modest 2 storey extension to Wellhouse Farm.

The applicant has taken account of all of the comments in the original rejection made by the planning officer and has now produced an alternative proposal which satisfies the reason for the initial rejection i.e. "not modest compared to the original dwelling". The new proposal addresses and offers other significant benefits.

1. It significantly reduces the size of the proposal by 70% to 15 sq. m2. This is now a minor increase of only 3% of the existing building and makes it a very modest extension, addressing the key concern.
2. Another point the officer makes in his recommendation to reject was ***"The site lies within an elevated area of open countryside"***
3. ***"that it is not appropriate development for this green belt setting."*** This extension is hidden from public view, it cannot be seen from any public property or neighbouring land. This small extension is to the rear of the property when viewed from Biddulph and cannot be seen it from any road. There is a little used public right of way in the adjacent field which the applicant owns, from which it may be seen. However, whilst the applicant will undertake to plant suitable evergreen trees to block any view from the public right of way, the proposal also significantly enhances the visual impact of the building and this would probably be unnecessary.
4. Since the extension will not be seen from any public property, neighbouring property or land and the curtlage of the property is in excess of 40,000 sq m, this small extension of 15 sq m does not have any impact of any significance on either the greenbelt or the public.
5. The planning officer suggests rejection indicating that this original extension represents "***encroachment***". The revised small extension cannot be seen by general public and is to the rear of the property representing impact of 0.37% (15m sq v 40000 m sq curtlage) which is insignificant.
6. The new proposal does not extend or project from any existing walls so does not increase the overall shape of the building.
7. There were **no** local objections to the original proposal and so given that this is on a much smaller scale – we would not expect any objections to this.
8. The original proposal also was accepted by Biddulph town council and was recommended for approval based on exterior appearance and for same reasons as above this smaller proposal would too.
9. There was no objection from parks & countryside re impact on public right of way.
10. The proposal would also **significantly** improve the external appearance of the property by balancing the 2 sides to the rear whilst not impacting on the public view or the greenbelt.

Based on the above, the applicant feels that this re-submission being a modest proposal meets the planning officers concerns, does not impact on the greenbelt or public or neighbours and improves the architectural balance and feels quite strongly that it should now be approved.

J. H. Eyre

2/3/2010