DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2019/0535 **Valid 05/09/2019**	**281 EAVES LANE** **ARMSHEAD**	**PROPOSED DEMOLITION OF SINGLE STOREY REAR BUILDING AND ERECTION OF TWO STOREY AND SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSIONS FORMING BEDROOMS AND KITCHEN.** **(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)**

MAIN ISSUES
Impact on the Green Belt, character and appearance of the area and the amenity of the area.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE
Semi detached white rendered cottage. Drive slopes up from the roadside to an elevated property. The cottage is one in a little row of four that appear on Eaves Lane, a country road that winds through open Green Belt between settlements. Road runs between traditional hedgerow, occasional mature trees, and stones walls. Open farm land beyond the roadside and to the rear of the cottage.

PROPOSAL
An existing two storey side extension built in the 1980s would be built out to the rear so that it lines up with the existing rear elevation and takes its ridge up 0.5m to that of the main dwelling – filling out a little nib or alcove at the rear.

Additionally a ground floor extension would project 5metres from the full width of the rear elevation – this would replace an existing long thin flat roof extension that projects from rear elevation and has its rear wall built along the shared boundary with the adjoining neighbour.

An existing integral garage in the 80s side extension would be converted into a lounge space and an up and over door replaced with a window that matches the adjacent frame.

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 Area
DC1 Design Considerations

T1 Development and Sustainable Transport

National Planning Policy Framework
Section(s) 2 Achieving sustainable development; 4 Decision Making, 12 Achieving Well Designed Places; 13 Green Belt; 15 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment.

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS
84/13465/OLDDC Side extension. Approved and implemented.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity
Site Notice expiry date: 31st October 2019
Neighbour consultation period ends: 1st October 2019
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments
None

Town / Parish Comments
Werrington Parish Council: No Objection

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development
The property is in the Green Belt where development is, by definition harmful, unless it is provided for by one of the exceptions on the closed list at paragraph 145 of the NPPF. One of those 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.

In this case the original building is a small 19th Century semi detached cottage. It has already been disproportionately extended in the 1980s with footprint additions that have added more than 100%. Overall this proposal would add significantly to those additions which are already over and above that of the original. The proposal would result in further disproportionate extension and the exception would not provide for the development.

The development would be inappropriate and planning permission should not be granted unless there are very special circumstances that clearly outweigh the substantial weight that should be attributed to the Green Belt harm.

In this case there is already an existing flat roof single storey extension (23sq m) that would be demolished to make way for a 7metre by 5metre (35sq m) uniformly rectangular extension. If the flat roof extension were retained and extended using the provisions of the GPDO it could be extended to the side, without planning permission, with an addition that did not extend beyond the original rear wall by more than 6metres. That would result in another 12 sq. metres being added and a total extension footprint (a combination of existing long narrow extension and additions

that could be made as permitted development) that equalled that of the proposal but would not have the same uniform shape.

A 35sq metre rear extension would only be permitted if the applicant were to rely on the HNT process. However, the rear elevation of the existing extension already runs the whole of the boundary and, while it seems unlikely, even if the neighbour were to object, it would not harm his amenity. While it would not be as neatly arranged, the permitted extension would provide meaningful space and shape that would make it worthwhile, and therefore as a 'fall back' there is reasonable prospect of the permitted development being carried out if planning permission were refused for the current proposal.

Both forms of development (permitted and proposed) would be equally harmful to the Green Belt, however, the proposed extension would have a neater and more natural arrangement of shape and space provided within one coherent structure that provides essentially a reconfiguration of what could be the combined footprint of existing rear extension and that which would be permitted. As such, the additional merit found in the design and appearance is enough to favour the grant of planning permission as an alternative to the GPDO provisions.

Impact on Character and appearance
From the front the existing side extension runs through with a front elevation that is flush with that of the original, there is no visual break or set back. However the extension's ridge has a slightly dropped position below that of the main roof, this is because the side extension does not run the full width of the side elevation and its rear elevation does not line up with that of the original. However, particularly because the road is at a lower level and the property is raised up, the step down in roof of 0.5metres is barely noticeable from the front and if anything just makes the property look quite crooked or disjointed. The 1980s side extension has already made for a wide flat front elevation that has harmed the character and form of the original cottage, increasing the ridge height by this rather marginal extent would not make worse, to any discernible degree, the harm that has already occurred.

From the rear a rather long ugly flat roof extension would be replaced with a neat rectangular coherent structure with a shallow sloping tiled roof that would only flank part of the boundary and open the garden to some degree. There would be no harm to the character and appearance of the area.

Amenity
The dwelling is semi detached. An existing flat roof addition has a rear elevation that extends the entire 10metre length of the shared boundary flanking the neighbour's garden and limiting their ground floor outlook. The proposal would extend and flank the boundary by just 5 metres which they might consider to be an improvement on the existing situation. There has been no objection from neighbours.

Highway Safety
The proposal plans do not indicate the provision of additional bedrooms. Supplementary or improved parking provision is not required. The integral garage would be lost from the property but given the gradient of the drive it would appear to

have been rather impractical in any event. Appears as though three cars could park on the drive to the front and side.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The harm to the Green Belt would be equal to that of a legitimate GPDO 'fall back'. However, a more coherent design approach favours the grant of permission for the application proposal.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : APPROVE

Case Officer: Ben Hurst
Recommendation Date: 31st October 2019

X B.J. Haywood

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council