DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2019/0068 **Valid 04/02/2019**	**OAKLEIGH** **BOUNDARY ROAD** **BOUNDARY**	**PROPOSED ROOF CONVERSION, PORCH EXTENSION AND REAR SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION** **(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)**

MAIN ISSUES

- Green belt
- Design
- Amenity

DESCRIPTION OF SITE
Secluded rural detached bungalow in large semi woodland plot rear of the road frontage developments and at right angles.

PROPOSAL
To raise the roof height in order to create space for first floor living accommodation with dormers to the rear. Small single storey extensions front and rear.

Amended plans have been submitted following initial advice of the LPA. These lower the roof ridge height proposed and reduce the scale of the front extension principally with the aim of reducing the overall scale of the extensions in proportion to the original building.

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
DC3 Landscape and Settlement Setting
R1 Rural Diversification
R2 Rural Housing
NE1 Biodiversity
T1 Development and Sustainable Transport

Local Plan Submission Version (February 2018)
SS1 Development Principles
SS1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
SS10 Other Rural Areas Area Strategy

DC1 Design Considerations
DC3 Landscape and Settlement Setting
H1 New Housing Development
NE Biodiversity and Geological Resources
T1 Development and Sustainable Transport

National Planning Policy Framework July 2018
Paragraph(s) 1 – 14;
Section(s) 4 – Decision making; 12 – Achieving well designed places; 13 – Protecting Green Belt Land;

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS
00/00136/FUL – side extension with pitched roof – approved and implemented

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity
Site Notice expiry date: 21st March 2019
Neighbour consultation period ends: 4th march 2019
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments
One representation in support from resident of adjacent property (Oxclose): "We support this application as it will not be seen or affect us in any way and we are keen to see improvements in the village".

Town / Parish Comments
Forsbrook Parish Council – no consultation response received.

Severn Trent Water
Minimal impact on the public sewerage network – no objection, no requirement for condition.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development
In accordance with policies SS1 and SS1a, the Council expects the development and use of land to contribute positively to the social, economic and environmental improvement of the Staffordshire Moorlands. When considering development proposals the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the NPPF. This means that planning applications that accord with the policies in the Core Strategy shall be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Where there are no policies relevant to the application or relevant policies are out of date at the time of making the decision then the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise – taking into account whether: any

adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework taken as a whole; or specific policies in that Framework indicate that development should be restricted.

Subject to Green Belt requirements Policy SS6c provides for the conversion extension or replacement of an existing rural building in accordance with policies R1 and R2.

In the rural areas outside of the development boundaries Policy SS6c is that strict control will continue to be exercised over inappropriate development within the Green Belt allowing only for exceptions as defined by Government Policy.

The NPPF states at paragraph 144 that: "When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt."

The fundamental aim of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. The Government identifies five purposes of the Green Belt:

- To prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas;
- To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another;
- To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- To preserve the setting and special character of historic market towns and
- To assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Inappropriate development is by definition harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances (NPPF 143 NPPF paragraphs 145 and 146 set out specific exceptions by which certain forms of development can be considered as being not inappropriate in the Green Belt. One of these exceptions 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" (NPPF 145 c).

Scale

In ground plan area the original building was 85m2 and its volume 352m3. The year 2000 approved extension has added 21.6m2 in plan area – an increase of 25% over the original building. This extension scales as 90m3, also 25% of the original building, in volume terms.

In ground plan area the proposed new extensions (13.2m2 rear and 7m2 to the front) would add 20m2. Taken together with the year 2000 extension of 21.6m2 the combined extensions in plan area terms would be c.42m2. As a percentage of the plan area of the original building this equates to an increase of 49%. This is greater than would be typically accepted in the Green Belt. However the applicant points out that significant PD rights could be exercised well in excess of the amounts proposed here. PD rights were not removed with 2000 consent and it must be considered that these represent realisable 'fall-back' options.

The now proposed increase in roof ridge height is 0.5m as opposed to 1.2m in the first submitted plan.

The agent has submitted volume figures for the various extensions bringing the total to 198m3 or 53% over the original building.

Design
With various adjustments sought by the LPA the scheme is now found acceptable. The increase in roof ridge height is modest and the rear dormers sit well particularly now their ridges are lower relative to the main roof ridge. There could be some reservation about the rear 'sun-lounge' extension but this is in a concealed location and is not unduly harmful in any event. There could also be some reservation about the front extension given that it positions the front door into a side elevation. It is though relevant to note that the access drive to this property sweeps up to one side of the building rather than directly to the front. The door would thus face the head of the drive making the proposed layout logical.

Materials are not stated in the drawing but the symbolisation implies brick. However the application form states 'render'. This has been discussed with the agent and a condition to stipulate brick to match will be accepted. The dormer wall materials are not stated but the agent has advised that hanging tile will be preferred. Again this can be stipulated by condition.

Amenity
Secluded from the nearest neighbours by intervening garden shrubs and trees and at separation distances in excess of 40m there would be no adverse impacts on neighbour amenity. With ample available garden space there would be no harm to the property's own amenity space.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE
Being satisfied as to design and amenity as discussed in the report, the main consideration is whether the proposal is acceptable in terms of the impact on the Green Belt. As discussed, the plan area and volume calculations suggest a larger than would normally be accepted proposal. This leads to the conclusion that the proposal must amount to 'inappropriate' development in the green belt.

However the PD fall back options can be considered viable and realistic. In the view of the front of the property (which is not a public view) the modest increase in roof ridge height would not appear visually disproportionate. There may be some glimpsed public visibility of the rear of the property from the public road to the SE but at distance so as not to be noticeable.

Due to the available and realisable PD fall back – potentially significantly more harmful than the scheme under consideration – these should be accepted as very special circumstances sufficient to clearly outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness. In view of this it would be appropriate to add a condition removing PD rights.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : approve

Case Officer: Arne Swithenbank
Recommendation Date: 2nd April 2019

X B.J. Haywood

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council