DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2019/0477 **Valid 16/08/2019**	**RED RIDGE CLEWLOWS BANK** **STOCKTON BROOK**	**SINGLE STOREY FLAT ROOF ORANGERY.** **(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)**

MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of development (Green Belt);
- Design and visual impact (character and appearance);
- Neighbour amenity;
- Highways;
- Drainage;
- Planning history of the site.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site consists of a detached dwelling known as Red Ridge, Clewlows Bank Stockton Brook. The dwelling occupies a visually prominent and elevated position above Clewlows Bank. There is external amenity space to the front and rear in the form of garden areas and patios. The dwelling forms part of a readily identifiable building line and boundaries are marked by fencing and hedgerows.

For the purposes of planning policy consideration the application site is located within the Green Belt. To the west (on the opposite side of the road) there are open fields. Footpath 7 (Bagnall Parish) runs along the eastern side of the application site (although not within it). The application site does not form part of any Conservation Area and there are no Listed Buildings within the vicinity which would need to be considered.

PROPOSAL

The application is for the erection of a flat roof rear extension to provide an enlarged kitchen/dining/lounge area which would be finished with a cream render. The extension would project 3.010m from the rear wall of the existing house however at 5.848m it would not span the full width of the dwelling. The extension would be positioned closer to the northern boundary than the south, continuing the line of the northern facing wall. Natural light would enter the new living space by the provision of two small windows within the southern facing wall and glazed, full height, concertina style doors leading out into the rear garden.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Adopted 2014)

SS1	Development Principles
SS1a	Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
SS6c	Other Rural Areas Area Strategy
DC1	Design Considerations
R2	Rural Housing
T1	Development and Sustainable Transport

Supplementary Planning Guidance

1. Space About Dwellings
2. Design Principles for Development in the Staffordshire Moorlands: New Dwellings and Extensions to Dwellings.

Supplementary Planning Document

1. Staffordshire Moorlands Design Guide

Emerging Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan

National Policy Guidance

Paragraph 48 of the newly adopted NPPF states that:

"…decision-takers may also give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

- the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced the preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);

- the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and

- the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in this Framework (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).

Local Plan process

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. An examination in public is ongoing in order to determine whether the Local Plan is sound and legally compliant. 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 was the subject of public consultation between 18th September 2019 and 31st October 2019. The schedule consisted of modifications that the Inspector has so far deemed necessary to make the Local Plan sound. Following the consultation, the Inspector is expected to consider the responses before issuing his final report. Depending on the recommendations in the report, the Council may then be in a position to adopt the Local Plan.

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 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.

<u>Emerging Policies</u>

The following policies are considered to be relevant to this application:

SS1	Development Principles (Moderate)
SS1a	Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development (Significant)
SS10	Other Rural Areas Strategy (Limited)
DC1	Design Considerations (Moderate)
H1	New Housing Development (Limited)
T1	Development and Sustainable Transport (Moderate)
Appendix 8	Parking Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework

Including sections;

2: Achieving sustainable development
9: Promoting sustainable transport
12: Achieving well-designed places
13: Protecting Green Belt land

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

HNT/2019/0004	Single-storey rear extension. Planning permission required. Scheme does not comply with the larger homes notification procedure.
SMD/2018/0748	Rear extension to existing dwelling. Refused.
SMD/2018/0600	Raise existing roof ridge height. Approve.
SMD/2018/0072	Raising of existing ridge and single storey rear extension. Resubmission of SMD/2017/0523). Refused.
SMD/2017/0523	Rear extension and raising of ridge height to accommodate rooms in roof space. Refused.
06/00809/FUL	Rear extension and conservatory. Approved.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 14/09/2019.
Neighbour consultation period ends: 09/09/2019.

Public Comments: No representations received.

Bagnall Parish Council: No objections to the application.

Severn Trent Water: No objections to the application and no drainage condition is required. STW advise that there may be a public sewer located within the application site.

Staffordshire County Council Highways: No objections to the application on highways grounds.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development, Design/visual impact (character and appearance)

The application site is located within the Green Belt, therefore requiring consideration of section 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the relevant Green Belt/open countryside policies of the Council's Core Strategy (policies listed above). NPPF paragraph 145 outlines the requirement for councils to regard the construction of new buildings as 'inappropriate development' unless they relate to one of the listed exceptions. Relevant to this application is the consideration

of paragraph 145 part C; ‘the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original dwelling.’ Paragraph 143 outlines that ‘inappropriate development’ is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Consideration is therefore given to whether the proposed extension (together with any previous additions) result in a ‘disproportionate addition’ and if so whether there are any very special circumstances to justify the development.

Core Strategy policy SS6c allows for the conversion, extension of replacement of an existing rural building in accordance with policies R1 and R2. Policy R2 allows for domestic extensions within the rural areas where they are ‘appropriate in scale and design and do not have a detrimental impact on the existing dwelling and character of the rural area’. Core Strategy policy DC1 is a focused design policy where there is a requirement for schemes to be of a high quality and add value to the local area. The policy also requires for proposals to be designed to respect the site and their surroundings and protect the amenity of the area including residential amenity in terms of satisfactory daylight, sunlight, outlook, privacy and soft landscaping.

A planning history search of the site reveals that there are a number of planning applications (approvals and refusals) linked to the Red Ridge dwelling.

Application reference number 06/00809/FUL granted consent for a rear extension and a conservatory. This application has been implemented as the pitched roof rear extension has been built. The site visit confirmed that the conservatory had not been erected but the consent is extant; this is a material consideration.

SMD/2017/0523 was refused for reasons of 1) Inappropriate Green Belt development (disproportionate additions) and 2) design which was out of keeping with the dwelling and character of the area.

SMD/2018/0072 was refused for reasons of 1) inappropriate Green Belt development (disproportionate additions) and 2) extensions being out of scale with the host dwelling and detrimental to the character of the area.

SMD/2018/0600 (Raising the height of roof ridge) was approved.

SMD/2018/0748 was refused by reasons of 1) inappropriate Green Belt development (disproportionate additions) and 2) extensions being out of scale with the host dwelling and detrimental to the character of the area.

HNT/2019/0004 was an application for a larger homes extension (PD notification development). Application was rejected due to not complying with Class A Permitted Development rights.

It is noted that SMD/2018/0072 proposed raising the ridge height and the erection of a rear extension which was refused. The following two applications then split the refused proposal with the aim of securing permission for each separately. SMD/2018/0600 approved the ridge height but SMD/2018/0748 refused the rear extension. During consideration of SMD/2018/0600 the officer report concluded that the application was acceptable (application approved) but such alterations (the roof

extension) would result in extensions to the property having 'reached a maximum permissible under current planning policy.' The case officer was clear that no further additions would be able to be supported.

The plans now submitted for consideration show the approval for the raising of the ridge and rear dormer windows and also the area where the 2006 application approved the conservatory. It has already been acknowledged that the rear conservatory extension proposal is extant and so are the SMD/2018/0600 (roof ridge) proposals. The scheme now before the council is for a flat roof rear extension which has a larger footprint than the extant conservatory and a roof which is higher than it.

The footprint of the proposal is slightly smaller than the rear extension refused by SMD/2018/0748 but the roof shape and height has changed from a pitched roof to a flat roof which now exceeds the eaves height of the existing house and projects beyond the roof slope.

In terms of footprint size, the current scheme is 5.848m wide x 3.010m deep. The rejected scheme (SMD/2018/0748) proposed a footprint of 5.848m wide and 3.343m deep. The reduction in footprint is so minor that it is not considered sufficient to overcome the reasons why SMD/2018/0748 was refused and the change of roof shape has arguably added a further objection. The flat roof would not tie in well with the appearance of the existing house; rather the addition would appear as a box-like structure attached to the rear gable. The flat roof is higher than the eaves of the existing house and its positioning (continuation of the northern wall) means that the upper sections of the wall overlap and project beyond the height of the sloping roof to which it is attached. As referenced earlier in the report, planning policies require developments to be well-designed and the size and shape of an addition should respect the existing dwelling to ensure the new addition fits neatly with the old. Unfortunately this scheme does not meet this objective.

It is concluded that the proposal is inappropriate Green Belt development and presents a development (the design of which) is not in-keeping with the existing property. No very special circumstances have been advanced as part of this submission; it is noted that no very special circumstances have been accepted as part of any previous application.

Neighbour amenity

The proposed extension would be positioned adjacent to the northern boundary of the site near to a dwelling known as Grassmere; this is the same location as a number of previous submissions where the relationship between dwellings has been considered and accepted. Furthermore it is noted that the proposed location (and projection distance) is the same as the extant conservatory consent from 2006. It is concluded that the scheme is acceptable in neighbour amenity terms.

Highways

The application does not include any parking/access alterations. The County Highways officer has assessed the scheme and raises no objections to it.

Drainage

Severn Trent Water (STW) have confirmed they have no objection to the application and do not request any drainage conditions. STW do comment that there may be a public sewer running through the application site and that contact must be made with them to discuss proposals.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

For the reasons outlined above it is recommended that the application is refused. The scheme is considered to be inappropriate development within the Green Belt. The scheme is materially larger than that of the extant conservatory (so no valid fall-back position) and is considered to be more harmful than the rear extension refused under application reference number SMD/2018/0748 due to its design including flat roof and poor relationship/proposed attachment to the existing dwelling. There are no very special circumstances that would outweigh the harm identified. The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : Refuse

Case Officer: Lisa Jackson
Recommendation Date: 08/11/2019

X B.J. Haywood

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council