DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2018/0779 **Valid 12/12/2018**	**BROOKSIDE COTTAGE** **CHEADLE ROAD** **DRAYCOTT IN THE MOORS**	**PROPOSED EXTENSION TO THE REAR.** **(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)**

MAIN ISSUES

- Is the proposal for inappropriate development, would there be other harms to the Green Belt?
- Are there other considerations that would weigh in favour?
- Other matters – Design and Amenity Impacts

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application relates to a two storey detached cottage which has been extended over time and is located within the Green Belt. It is located on Brookside which is a rural lane taken off Cheadle Road, which is a Public Right of Way (Number 294).

The application site is located beyond the development boundary, within the Parish of Draycott-in-the-Moors.

To the north the application site is bound by a ribbon of detached dwellings along Cheadle Road, immediately to the north is a dwelling known as Hideaway, also accessed off Brookside. To the west the application site is bound by Brookside which is a PROW running adjacent to a small watercourse running in a north-south direction. To the south the application site is bound by another cottage, known as Dagmar. To the east the application site is bound by Cheadle Road.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks planning permission to enlarge the dwellinghouse with an addition that would extend from and span almost the entire width of the dwelling's rear elevation. Part of the development would replace an existing PVc conservatory with a gabled addition that would have a solid side wall, tiled full pitch roof, and oak framed glazing to the gabled elevation. The replacement would have a similar footprint to the existing conservatory is on a very similar footprint. The remaining part of the addition would be a flat roof addition with a parapet wall and roof lantern. Both parts of the addition would be adjoining with internal doors providing access between the two.

The enlargement requires planning permission because the 'gabled' part of the addition projects more than 4 metres from the original rear wall of the dwellinghouse and that would exceed a limitation that applies to development permitted by Class A, Part 1 of the General Permitted Development Order 2015.

The applicant includes with the application a reference to an earlier planning permission that was granted only to replace the conservatory and a certificate of

lawfulness that confirms that a separate flat roof extension that does not extend as far as the conservatory replacement would, if built on its own, be permitted by the GPDO.

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 Area Strategy
DC1 Design Considerations
T1 Development and Sustainable Transport
National Planning Policy Framework
Paragraph(s) 1-12
Section(s) 12 & 13

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

SMD/1982/0910 Two storey side extension to form larger kitchen, utility, porch, bedroom and bathroom APPROVED
SMD/1988/1317 Extension to form larger lounge, playroom, porch and W.C and first floor bathroom APPROVED 03/06/1988
SMD/1999/0154 Domestic extensions to include new chimney, rear conservatory and store APPROVED 25/01/2000
SMD/2018/0503 Replacement of Conservatory. APPROVED 18th October 2018.
SMD/2018/0654 Certificate of Lawfulness for addition to rear. APPROVED 29th Nov 2018.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 25th December 2018
Neighbour consultation period ends: 3rd January 2019

Public Comments
None

Town / Parish Comments
Awaited

OFFICER COMMENTS

Is the development inappropriate in the Green Belt?

The dwelling is situated in the Green Belt where development is inappropriate, and by definition harmful, unless it is provided for on the closed list of exceptions, at paragraph 145 and 146 of the NPPF. The development that would be carried out would enlarge an existing building and, relevant to that, one of the exceptions at

paragraph 145(c) provides for the 'extension of a building providing it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.

The proposed development, in addition to existing extensions already carried out, would mean that in total the footprint of the original dwelling would be increased by approximately 120% with the additions extending and encroaching toward wide open undeveloped Green Belt countryside beyond. The development therefore, would indeed result in disproportionate addition, it would not fall within the relevant exception and would be inappropriate. There would be harm to the Green Belt in respect of this, and any harm to the Green Belt must be attributed substantial weight. Planning permission can only be granted where other considerations or circumstances clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt.

If there has been harm to the Green Belt are there any other considerations or circumstances that might outweigh those harms?

In this case the applicant has already been granted planning permission for the part of the development that would replace the uPvC conservatory to be built as a separate entity - it needed permission because it would extend more than 4metres from the dwelling's original elevation. Any Green Belt harm was set aside because the replacement had the same footprint as the existing conservatory and would introduce improved design and use of materials. The applicant then went onto demonstrate that using permitted development allowances, he could also build without any further grant of planning permission, the flat roof part of the development as a separate entity, because it would not extend more than 4metres from the original rear elevation. Providing there was at least a narrow gap between the two parts, both could be built separately without any further planning permission being required. However, if the two parts were to be built as one joined single act of development, without the gap, the whole of the development would require planning permission because part of it extends more than 4metres beyond the original rear elevation.

Joining the two parts and building them as one would be to eliminate an inconsequential, in Green Belt terms, contrived very narrow gap that would look rather odd. Building the two parts together would bring a certain design continuity that would weight in favour of this planning permission.

Other Matters

It seems rather unnecessary to revisit or discuss in detail matters relating to the design of the proposal or its potential impacts on the amenity of neighbours. With the previous grant of planning permission the council considered the part that would replace the conservatory to be of a 'high quality design' and that overall it would not cause the neighbouring dwellings to lose amenity. The flat roof part of the development could in the most part be in any event built without any planning permission as permitted development.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The development would result in Green Belt harm. However, in this case there are clear reasons that weigh in favour of granting a planning permission.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : APPROVE

Case Officer: Ben Hurst
Recommendation Date: 28/01/2019

X B.J. Haywood

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council