DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2019/0504 (FULL PLANNING PERMISSION) & SMD/2019/505 (LISTED BUILDING CONSENT) **Valid 19/08/2019**	**HARRACLES MILL COTTAGE DUNWOOD ROAD RUDYARD**	**ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION.** **(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)**

MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of Development and Green Belt
- Impact on heritage assets
- Design
- Amenity

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site relates to a residential plot of land to the south of Rudyard village accessed via Dunwood Road, a single track also serves as a public footpath and extends eastwards from Dunwood Lane which serves a small number of properties.

The site is located outside of the development boundary in the open countryside and in the Green Belt and within the Rudyard Conservation Area.

The site itself contains Herracles Mill Cottage; a two storey rectangular stone building that was converted to a residential dwelling following consent granted in 1978.

Herracles Mill Cottage sits immediately to the south west of Harracles Mill, a Grade II Listed Building. As noted by the Conservation Officer, the cottage has a strong link with the Mill and is therefore regarded as a curtilage listed structure. The existing dwelling has benefited from a single storey extension that was granted permission (and Listed Building Consent) in 2004.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks permission for a single storey rear extension which would sit adjacent to the existing extension approved in 2004. The plans show the extension would be single storey, having a consistent eaves height with the current extension but having a lower ridge height. The proposed extension is shown to span a width of 3.75m and a depth of 3.0m.

The extension as originally submitted was shown to consist of a stone plinth with double glazed units separated by oak frames making up the walls and roof. The ridgeline would consist of lead flashing.

In order to address design and heritage concerns raised by the Conservation Officer, revised plans have been submitted which show a stone extension which reads as a flush extension to the existing rear extension.

A Listed Building Consent (LBC) application has also been submitted for this development under SMD/2019/0505.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Act 2004 requires proposals to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan taking into consideration any material considerations relevant to the determination of the application.

The Local Development Plan for this site comprises the Saved Policies of the Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan (1998); Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy (adopted 26th March 2014) and any relevant Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD's).

The Staffordshire Moorlands Emerging Local Plan (Submission Version February 2018) has now been through an Examination by an Independent Planning Inspector and as such planning policies within it can be given appropriate weight, in line with paragraph 48 of the NPPF.

The Council agreed to publish the Local Plan Submission Version for representations in February 2018. At this point, the Council agreed that the Local Plan was "sound". Formal representations were then invited from residents, businesses and other stakeholders to provide them with the opportunity to support or challenge the soundness or legal compliance of the Local Plan. This stage in the process followed three previous public consultations since 2015 which had informed the preparation of the Local Plan alongside a comprehensive evidence base.

In June 2018, the Council subsequently agreed to submit the Local Plan Submission Version to the Secretary of State for examination. Hearing sessions were conducted in October 2018 and the Inspector issued his initial post-hearing advice in January 2019 which set out some actions for the Council and a range of modifications that would be necessary to make the plan sound. The full schedule of modifications is to be determined and will be subject to consultation in due course. The Inspector will then be in position to write his final report. Subject to the findings of the appointed Inspector, the Local Plan can then be adopted by the Council. This will be towards the end of 2019 at the earliest. At this point, Upon adoption, it the Local Plan will supersede the adopted Core Strategy and become part of the statutory development plan for the District.

In this context, the Council's position on the weight to be given to the policies contained in the Local Plan Submission Version in terms of the three criteria set out in Paragraph 48 of the NPPF is as follows:

- The stage of preparation – the Local Plan is now at an advanced stage of preparation as the Council has submitted it to the SoS for examination

- The extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies – this varies depending on the policy in question. The Officer Comments section of this report identifies the level of outstanding objections to each policy and recommends the amount of weight to be given to them at this stage in the process

- The degree of consistency of policies with the NPPF – given that the Council has submitted a Local Plan that it considers to be sound, all policies are deemed to be consistent with the NPPF.

The revised National Planning Policy Framework (2019) sets out the Governments planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. As stated in paragraph 2 of the NPPF, the document is a material consideration which must be taken into account in planning decisions.

Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Adopted 2014)

SS1 Development Principles
SS1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
SS6 Rural Areas Strategy
SS6c Other Rural Areas Strategy
R2 Rural Housing
SD1 Sustainable Use of Materials
DC1 Design Considerations
DC2 The Historic Environment
DC3 Landscape and Settlement Character

National Planning Policy Framework

Achieving Sustainable Development	Chapter 2
Achieving Well Designed Places	Chapter 12
Protecting Green Belt Land	Chapter 13
Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment	Chapter 16

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

SMD/1978/1153	Alterations to building to form living accommodation (no details of passing etc.) (Approved 20/11/1978)
SMD/1988/1602	Removal of condition on previous application for use of barn as 2 x private dwellings (Refused 10/08/1988)
SMD/2002/1290	Single storey rear extension (Withdrawn)

SMD/2003/0310 & SMD/2003/0317	Full and LBC application for demolition and rebuilding of single storey extension (Refused 15/09/2003)
SMD/2003/1299 & SMD/2003/1300	Full and LBC application for single storey rear extension (Approved 04/02/2004)

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 25th October 2019
Neighbour consultation period ends: 10th September 2019
Press Advert: 25th September 2019

Public Comments

No comments received

Town / Parish Comments

Horton Parish Council: No objection

SMDC Conservation Officer

Initial response – 25th October

The Rudyard Conservation Area character appraisal recognises the extensive and panoramic vista from Dunwood Lane looking out to Harracles Mill, the mill cottage and Harracles Hall with water meadows to the south and rolling hills to the background. The mill cottage is an important part of this vista and has a significant functional relationship with the mill which is why it has always been regarded as a curtilage Listed structure. This is recognised in the heritage statement.

The building has a historic significance of its own being the mill cottage and of simple, functional design with a narrow, linear form. A lean-too extension was approved in 2003 (SMD/03/01383/LBC) to provide a kitchen and snug. The extension is a modest, subordinate addition and does not fully mask the historic building behind. Arguably, the extension sits on the building's frontage (although I have not seen the other elevation or had the benefit of the full floorplan)

The proposal to add a further extension on this elevation is contentious. A conservatory addition would be at odds with the simple, functional character and form of this mill cottage and would be visible in prominent views. A conservatory is a very domestic structure would which would stand out on a building of predominantly solid walls and few openings. The pitch has had to be dropped to accommodate the first floor window and this has lead to an awkward relationship with the existing extension. The existing extension is the maximum that this elevation can accommodate.

Further response – 28th October

The revised plans still propose a further addition to a previous extension which was carefully designed to be subordinate and not dominate the prominent elevation overlooking the valley. Although it is now proposed to have a tiled roof and matching form it will still obscure the historic walling and alter further the form of the building. Two large openings side by side will also look rather contrived and the remaining upper floor window will become rather squeezed in by the extension. Rooflights will also highlight the prominence of the addition. It is just too much for this elevation to accommodate comfortably and it is a further dilution of its historic significance.

I have also tracked down a historic photo taken at around the time of listing showing its simple form (and prominence in views across the valley). It appears to have witnessed significant changes since this date.

SMDC Conservation Liaison Panel

OBJECTS: the building has already received one extension. The elevation is prominent (effectively the buildings frontage) and a conservatory would not respect the character of the building.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The application site lies outside of the development boundary in the open countryside and also falls within the Green Belt. As such, the application is subject to Core Strategy (CS) policies SS6, SS6c and R2 and restrictive policies relating to Green Belt development set out within Chapter 13 of the NPPF.

CS Policies SS6 and SS6c are the strategic development policies fort he rural area and aim to strictly control development in order to ensure that the intrinsic character of the rural area is preserved or enhanced. CS Policy R2 sets out the types of housing development that will be supported in the rural areas, and includes extensions to an existing rural dwelling provided that they are appropriate in scale and design and do not have a detrimental impact on the existing dwelling and character of the rural area.

Chapter 13 of the NPPF contains the restrictive policies relating to Green Belt development. Paragraph 143 states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

Paragraph 144 of the NPPF goes on to state that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. ‘Very special circumstances’ will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

Paragraphs 145 and 146 of the NPPF go on to list the types of development that do not fall within the definition of inappropriate development, and as such, are acceptable in principle (subject to all other material considerations). One such

exception 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”.

The definition of ‘original building’ is contained within the glossary of the NPPF and comprises the building as it stood on 1st July 1948 or if built after that date, its original form. There is no definition within the Local Plan or the NPPF as to what constitutes ‘disproportionate additions’ and as such, each application will be determined on its own merits. However, a useful starting point for assessing whether a proposal comprises disproportionate additions is to calculate the original footprint and volume of the original building, before calculating any additional footprint and volume resulting from previous extensions, and then factoring in the footprint and volume increase of the proposed development.

Based on a site visit and a review of the planning history, the original building in this case is judged to be how the building stood at the time of the planning application in 1978 to convert what was previously an agricultural barn to a dwelling.

The footprint of the original building is 20m x 5.3m (106 square metres), with the approximate volume of this two storey building being calculated at 508 cubic metres. The existing extension, added to the original building, comprises a footprint of 3.2m x 7.2m (23 square metres) and an approximate volume of 78 cubic metres.

Based on the above calculations, the building has benefited from a 21% increase in floor area and a 17% increase in overall volume of development.

The proposed extension covers a floor area of 3.75m x 3.0m (11 square metres) and an approximate volume of 28 cubic meters. When combined with the existing extension, this proposed development would equate to a 32% increase in footprint comparable to the original building, and a 21% in overall volume.

The above assessment has led me to conclude that the proposed extensions would not result in disproportionate additions to the original building within the context of national Green Belt policy, and as such, an extension of this scale could be supported in principle subject to all other material considerations which in this case include the impacts of the proposal on heritage assets, design, and amenity.

Impact on Heritage Assets

Section 66(1) of the Town and Country Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 requires local authorities in considering whether to grant permission of development which affects a listed building or its setting, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Section 72(1) of the Town and Country Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 states that with respect to any buildings or other land within a conservation area, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

Policy DC2 of the adopted Core Strategy seeks to safeguard and where possible enhance the historic environment by resisting development which would harm or be

detrimental to the special character and historic heritage of the District's towns and villages and those interests of acknowledged importance and promoting development which sustains, respects or enhances buildings and features which contribute to the character or heritage of an area and those interests of acknowledged importance.

Chapter 16 of the NPPF contains the relevant national planning policies relating to heritage conservation. Paragraph 193 states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, and the most important the asset, the greater the weight should be.

Paragraphs 195 and 196 of the NPPF set out how the potential impact of a development proposal on a heritage asset should be assessed.

Where a proposal will lead to less than substantial harm or total loss of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless there are substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm. Where a development will lead to less than substantial harm, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

The existing building is a curtilage Grade II Listed Building which lies within the Rudyard Conservation Area in a prominent location and has previously been extended at the rear following the granting of planning permission in 2003. This extension is a simple lean-to structure which spans approximately two thirds of the elevation, thus allowing the original elevation to be read in conjunction with the old without resulting in any harm to the special architectural qualities of the building or the character and appearance of the wider conservation area.

Objections were received from the Conservation Officer and Conservation Liaison Panel in relation to the plans as originally submitted, which raised concerns with regards to the domestic appearance and distinct contrast with the predominantly solid structure of the existing house. The Conservation Officer was quite clear in concluding that the existing extension is the maximum scope of development that this elevation can accommodate.

The applicant has submitted revised plans which show the domestic conservatory style extension to be replaced by a more traditional stone structure with bi-fold doors in the rear and two small windows sitting on top of one another in the southern side elevation. The building line and tiled roof would sit flush with the existing extension.

I concur with the conclusions of the Conservation Officer that whilst the revised scheme does represent some improvement with regards to its relationship with the original building, the original and special architectural qualities of the original walls will be dominated and consumed by any further additions to this elevation. It is considered that this elevation can not accommodate any further development without resulting in harm to the special qualities of the curtilage Listed Building or the character and appearance of the wider Conservation Area.

The degree of harm upon these statutory heritage assets is considered to be less than substantial for the purposes of the NPPF. There are no public benefits

associated with the proposal that outweighs the harm to the heritage assets, and as such, the application conflicts with CS Policy DC2 and relevant restrictive policies within Chapter 16 of the NPPF.

Design

CS Policy SS1 sets out a number of development principles which new development should adhere to in order to contribute positively to the social, economic, and environmental improvement of the Staffordshire Moorlands.

CS Policy R2 sets out the types of housing development that will be supported in the rural areas, and includes extensions to an existing rural dwelling provided that they are appropriate in scale and design and do not have a detrimental impact on the existing dwelling and character of the rural area.

CS Policy DC1 sets out a list of design considerations that new development should incorporate into any new scheme. In particular new development should be designed to respect the site and its surroundings and promote a positive sense of place and identity through its scale, density, layout, siting, landscaping, character and appearance.

The Staffs Moorlands ‘Design Guide’ SPD and ‘Design Principles’ SPD provides further useful design guidance for extensions and alterations to buildings in the rural areas.

Paragraph 127 states amongst other things that decisions should ensure that developments will add to the overall quality of the area; are visually attractive as a result of good architecture; and are sympathetic to the surrounding built environment.

Paragraph 130 states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, taking into account any local design statements or style guides in plans or supplementary planning documents.

The original plans submitted with the application shows a domestic glazed conservatory which effectively fills in the corner between the existing extension and the side gable wall of the main dwelling. Whilst subordinate with regards to its height, it was considered that the erection of this structure would begin to dominate and consume the original walls of the dwelling, thus resulting in detrimental impact to the character and appearance of the building. It was also considered that the clash of materials and amount of glazing would be read as an incongruous feature from views from the public right of way on Dunwood Road and from elevated views from the north on Dunwood Lane.

Revised plans have been submitted which shows a more traditional stone built extension which would read as a flush continuation of the existing building. The Design Principles SPD requires that new development can fit neatly with the old thus making a clear distinction between the two.

The revised extension would merely be a continuation, albeit a modest one, of the existing elevation and would not be possible to read this addition clearly within the context of the original building and the current extension.

The revised proposal would be disproportionate to the original dwelling in so far as it would consume and dominate the rear elevation to the extent to the detriment of the character and appearance of the building. As such, the principle of further extending the existing extension conflicts with the design principles set out within CS Policy SS2, R2 and DC1 and Supplementary Planning Guidance, and paragraph 127 of the NPPF.

Amenity

CS Policy DC1 states that new development should protect the amenity of the area, including residential amenity, in terms of satisfactory daylight, sunlight, outlook, and privacy.

The Staffs Moorlands 'Space about Dwellings' SPD provides useful guidance surrounding the minimum separation distances between neighbouring properties and habitable windows.

Paragraph 127 states that planning should create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

The nearest residential property to the site is the Harracles Mill building to the north east which sits behind an ancillary outbuilding. Aside from this, the nearest property to the south west is Bell Cottage, some 100m distant.

Given the nature and scale of the proposed development and distance from neighbouring properties, there are no considered to be any adverse impacts to neighbouring residential amenity arising from this development.

The fact that there would be no adverse impacts to residential amenity does not outweigh or mitigate the significant harm to heritage assets and the character and appearance of the building by virtue of its poor design.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

Policy SS1a of the adopted core strategy reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Paragraph 11 of the NPPF sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision taking, this means approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or, where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission, unless:

- the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or

- any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.

The application seeks full planning permission (and Listed Building Consent considered under SMD/2019/0505) for a single storey rear extension to Harracles Mill Cottage, Dunwood Road; a Grade II curtilage listed structure, located in the open countryside and the Green Belt.

Green Belt policy allows for the extension and alteration of a dwelling provided they are not disproportionate to the original building. An assessment of the application with regards to its percentage increase in footprint and overall volume has found that the proposal complies with Green Belt policy.

Following the submission of revised plans, it has been concluded that whilst the revisions represent an improvement comparable to the original plans, the principle of further extensions on the rear elevation of this property is not supported, as it will begin to dominate and consume the special architectural quality of the original walls of the main dwelling to the detriment of the character and appearance of the building and wider conservation area.

For the reasons outlined within the report, the application is considered to result in less than substantial harm to the special architectural qualities of the building and character and appearance of the conservation area. There are no public benefits that outweighs this harm.

As such, the application is considered to constitute an unsustainable form of development and is recommended for refusal for reasons relating to the harm to heritage assets and the character and appearance of the building by virtue of poor design.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Refuse

Case Officer: James Stannard
Recommendation Date: 30th October 2019

X B.J. Haywood

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council