**Smithy Farm** **Ref: KDR/JS005**
**Dial Lane**
**Congleton**
**Staffordshire Moorlands**
**CW12 3QN**

# Proposed Two & Single Storey Extensions, Construction of a Replacement Ancillary Garage/Workshop Building & Porch.

## Design and Access Statement
## (Incorporating a Heritage Statement)

11th September 2020

Kev Ryder
KDR Developments

**Contents**


1. Introduction
2. Description of the Site and Surroundings
3. Planning History
4. Planning Policy
5. Site Context
6. Design and Access Statement
7. Heritage Statement
8. Permitted Development
9. Conclusions
10. Appendix 1 – Staffordshire HER Entry: MST21919
11. Appendix 2 - Planning Application Submission – Document List.

1. **Introduction**

This document has been prepared by Mr K.D. Ryder of KDR Developments on behalf of Mr. & Mrs. Sheard in relation to their Full Planning Application submission for the proposed extensions and alterations to the existing dwelling at Smithy Farm.

This Application is submitted following a limited degree of informal Pre-Application engagement and discussion with Mr Benjamin Hurst, the Staffordshire Moorlands District Council ("the Council") Senior Planning Enforcement Officer, to positively assist in formulating a meaningful submission proposal.

This Statement includes a description of the development site and planning history, an evaluation of the context of the site, and a Design and Access Statement to justify the design rationale behind the proposed development, along with a précis Heritage Statement, followed by a summary of the main planning considerations considered relevant to this proposal.

The current owners have only owned Smithy Farm for a short period of time, being only a matter of months, yet, as the Council has already positively recognised and acknowledged, as part of their Officer Report ("OR") to planning application reference: SMD/2020/0316: the owners, despite having owned this farm for a relatively short expanse of time: a matter of months, and despite the clearly poor quality and restricted scale and nature of the existing agricultural buildings, have already made obvious and significant efforts to farm the land in a way that is proportionate to the holding, utilising both the open farmland and the existing agricultural buildings to the fullest effect possible, and also having explored routes to markets.

Following on from these previous comments of the Council in August 2020, and since that time, the owners have continued to progress, now being licensed to operate at local markets, and having a mixed and varied livestock count of some 100 animals.

In short:
The owners have committed their long term future and well being to this farm, which in turn and in a wider context, provides a broader benefit, in that it positively contributes to and supports the continuance of traditional farming activity in the locality, the rural economy, and good countryside stewardship.
This representing a clear continuance of stewardship that which has passed before through generations, with, for example: the previous owners, the Hudson family, both owning, residing and farming here since 1942, as a dairy farm, with this only coming to a close through, sadly, old age and bereavement, ultimately leading to the sale of the property to Mr & Mrs Sheard, the current owners, in October of 2019.

As part of this ongoing programme of long term commitment and improvement, the owners have already received planning permission from the Council to replace the existing dilapidated agricultural buildings, with this soon to be the subject of a second planning application submission seeking consent for a variation of the same to further assist the operational requirements of the farm going forward.

As also part of this ongoing programme of long term commitment and improvement to the property overall, the owners here respectfully seek planning permission from the Council to extend and make alteration to the existing dwelling farmhouse and ancillary buildings, which will also, ensure the preservation of this `historic farmstead` for future generations.

The farmhouse dwelling is a modest house at best, which has remained largely untouched, or improved, since its 19th century construction.
Its external appearance is somewhat deceptive in that its external stone walls, and in part internal, are, on average some 0.5m thick, resulting in a living space that internally, is considerably cramped and compressed.
In effect, this is currently a small 2 bedroom dwelling with an outside water closet.

By comparison, the Sheard's are a family of four, with, whilst this has not yet been formally confirmed to me by Mrs Sheard, i understand that this may soon become a family of five.

The dwelling has, as stated, been largely untouched since its construction, and, when you consider that, as far back as 2002, all of the Hudson family occupants were in their Eighties, the resultant effect is that, with respect, this has, just as with the current agricultural buildings, suffered the ravage of time, requiring a considerable degree of modernisation and remedial work.
This being confirmed by the selling agents in October 2019, quoting it as: "requiring modernisation and improvement".

In short:
The dwelling was effectively inhabitable when purchased, and remains so to date.
It is not known whether the dwellinghouse stood empty for a period of time prior to sale.
Mr & Mrs Sheard, as you have also seen in respect of the wider farm and agricultural elements, have commenced a degree of remedial works internally, yet seek your consent to progress further, to enable them to make this into their long term family home, and to also run their farming business effectively and provide the levels of on-site animal welfare and security required.

As set out, the firm and long term commitment of the owners to this property and farm is clear. Currently, notwithstanding that they are working parents, and given that they cannot yet reside at this property as their principal residence, they make on average, some 3 to 4 four mile round trips to and from the farm from their current home in Congleton daily, to tend to their livestock and to endeavour to ensure a degree of on-site security and animal welfare, as much as one can who lives remotely, which is far from ideal and not something that can, in all reasonableness, persist in the long term.

## 2. **Description of the Site and Surroundings**

Smithy Farm is a formal Agricultural Unit (Agricultural Holding Certificate No.: 37/064/0707), trading under the title: `Smithy Farm`, predominantly in the rearing and production of chickens, pigs, sheep and cattle for meat and market sale.

Smithy Farm is situated both adjacent to and fronting Dial Lane, between Congleton and Rushton Spencer, being located some 3.5 miles from Congleton, 7 miles from Leek, and 5 miles from Macclesfield, within the District of Staffordshire Moorlands, close it its administrative boundary with the Borough of Cheshire East.

Smithy Farm is located within the Green Belt.
None of its buildings are Listed, nor is it within a Conservation Area, yet is classified as a non designated Heritage Asset, being listed within the Staffordshire Historic Environment Record ("HER") under listing reference no.: MST21919, as a Historic Farmstead.
(a copy of the HER listing entry is provided at Appendix 1).

Smithy Farm extends to some 3.77 ha (9.32 ac) overall, broadly consisting of a detached farmhouse and grouping of ancillary buildings set within a semi circular walled curtilage fronting Dial Lane, with an adjacent agricultural access and farmyard, along with associated agricultural buildings to the West, wrapping around the farmhouse curtilage along its Western boundary and into its Northern quadrant, to the rear of the same, leading to a further larger agricultural building directly to the North, within the open farmland.
The majority of the holding consisting of open farmland situated to the West and North of the farmhouse curtilage, along with fringe amenity woodland and stream to its North Western edge.

The nature of the topography is one of a fairly level make up across the majority of the site, with a slight rise in levels in a Westerly to Easterly direction.

Whilst earliest available online historic OS mapping first denotes this property as built and present in 1891, it is recognised that the above HER entry does appear to suggest reference that this property may originate from a date somewhat earlier.

It is bordered to the North by existing open farm and amenity land, to the East by existing open farm and amenity land, to the South by Dial Lane highway, and beyond by a Barn opposite, followed by existing open farm and amenity land, to the South Southeast by a row of 3 terrace cottages, and to the West by existing open farm and amenity land, Dial Lane highway, and beyond by an agricultural holding, with continuing existing open farm and amenity land further beyond.

3. **Planning History**

Agricultural

- **SMD/2020/0316** - Proposed replacement Agricultural Buildings – Approved 21st August 2020.

Within the farmyard complex to the West is situated a long timber shed, previously extended at its Northern end with a concrete block building, fronting into the same, being that previously referred to as agricultural `Building A`.
In addition, situated in an isolated position within the open farmland to the North, is a larger `Nissen` type concrete block and arched sheet building, being that previously referred to as agricultural `Building B`.
This planning application and subsequent approval being in respect of both these `Buildings A & B`.

Residential

- **SMD/1978/0858** - Alterations and extension to kitchen – Approved / Invalid - 6th September 1978.

It is unknown whether this planning application was actually approved or deemed invalid, yet, whichever is the case, this proposal has not, in any event, been implemented to date.

- **SMD/2020/0100** - Enlargement of the dwelling house consisting of a two storey and single storey rear elevation extension and replacement front elevation porch – Refused 7th May 2020.

In respect of planning application reference: **SMD/2020/0100**:
Enlargement of the dwelling house consisting of a two storey and single storey rear elevation extension and replacement front elevation porch.

This application was refused planning permission on the 7th May 2020 for the following two reasons:
1. "The provision of the building would be inappropriate in the Green Belt and, by definition, harmful because it is not provided for by any of the exceptions listed at paragraph 145 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
It would be a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building and have greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development.
There are no other considerations that would amount to 'very special circumstances' that would clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt or any other harms resulting from the development.
The development would conflict with the terms of the NPPF and policy SS6c (SS10 of the emerging Local Plan) of the Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy."

2. "The development would result in harm to the character, appearance and heritage of the rural area because it would conceal the original rear elevation of an 18th Century Moorlands cottage with a large gable end that presents contemporary fenestration to the countryside beyond.
The development would be very exposed to and apparent from the public footpath numbered Biddulph Town 93.
Its design and appearance would not relate well to the existing dwelling in a way that would respect its form, scale and character in a subordinate complimentary manner .
The development would not comply with the adopted Design Guide, Development Plan strategy or policy in these respects and would specifically contravene policies DC1 and DC3 of the Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy of the yet to be adopted Local Plan 2016-2031."

**Current**

Agricultural

Further to that recent planning permission granted to planning application reference: SMD/2020/0316, a further planning application will shortly be submitted to the Council for consideration:

- Planning Application - Relocation of the quoted `Building B`.

Residential

In addition to this planning application submission, the following, in an alternate context, will shortly be submitted to the Council for consideration:

- Permitted Development – Planning Enquiry – Proposed Extensions & Alterations (Option 1),
- Permitted Development – Planning Enquiry - Proposed Extensions & Alterations (Option 2),
- Permitted Development – Prior Approval Application - `Larger Home` Extension (Option 3).

4. **Planning Policy**

Adopted Local Plan

The current adopted development plan for the District of Staffordshire Moorlands consists of the following:

- Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy 2026 – adopted 26th March 2014.
- This is supplemented by a number of adopted Supplementary Planning Documents and Guidance's ("SPD/SPG"), with one of this number being the:
  Staffordshire Moorlands Design Guide SPD, adopted on the 21st February 2018.

Emerging Local Plan

The Council is in the final stages of the preparation and subsequent adoption of their replacement Local Plan, being the:

- Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan 2016 – 2031 ("SMLP").

The emerging SMLP has undergone significant levels of public consultation and review by Mr Inspector Dakeyne.

The Submission Version Local Plan February 2019 was subject to a number of Main Modifications which were consulted upon in September to October 2019 and have been reviewed by the Inspector.

The Inspector held further hearings on the 4th & 5th February 2020, and subsequently provided his post hearing advice to the Council on the 27th February 2020, where he set out that he is no longer inviting or accepting any comments from any other parties involved in the examination.

The Council has responded to the Inspector on the 24th March 2020, providing further clarification, and setting out their intent to provide a revised schedule of Main Modifications imminently.

On July 20th 2020, the Council published the Inspector's final report thereby drawing a close to the examination in public. The report concludes that with the recommended main modifications, the emerging plan satisfies the requirements of Section 20(5) of the 2004 Act and meets the criteria for soundness in the National Planning Policy Framework ("The Framework").

The emerging SMLP is now at the most advanced stage of preparation prior to adoption as the Inspector has concluded that the Local Plan is sound subject to the recommended modifications being made.

It is anticipated that the emerging SMLP, subject to legal challenge, will receive formal adoption in the near future, and, upon adoption, it will replace the current Core Strategy.

Until this new Local Plan is adopted, whilst appreciating that the current Core Strategy remains the document in force, the emerging SMLP, given its advanced stage of progress, carries substantial weight in the decision making process.

5. **Site Context**

Smithy Farm is situated within the District of Staffordshire Moorlands, close it its administrative boundary with the Borough of Cheshire East to its West.
It is situated in the rural area both adjacent to and fronting Dial Lane within the Green Belt.

Smithy Farm forms part of a small mixed cluster of properties in reasonably close proximity at this location, made up of residential dwellings, farms and agricultural holdings.

In a wider context, being somewhat stereotypical of the rural area, the surrounding countryside, whilst mainly open, is dissected with numerous minor roads and lanes, along with a pepper potting of sporadic isolated dwellings, farms and agricultural smallholdings.

To the North it is bordered by rolling open farm and amenity land with distant views that mildly undulate and rise in the distance, along with intermittent field margin and woodland edge tree groupings and rows.

To the East it is bordered by Dial Lane highway, rolling open farm and amenity land with distant views that mildly undulate and rise in the distance, along with intermittent field margin and woodland edge tree groupings and rows, and existing pepper potted dwellings and farms in the distance, the closest of which being a farm holding off Gosberryhole Lane, some 486m distant.

To the South it is bordered by Dial lane highway, a single detached barn directly opposite, and beyond, by rolling open farm and amenity land that gradually rises to crest not far distant, along with intermittent field margin and woodland edge tree groupings and rows.
Online historic OS mapping indicates that this detached barn was built and present as at 1891.

To the Southeast, on the opposite side of Dial Lane is present a row of 3 terrace cottages known as `Ivy Cottage`, `Yoxholme`, and `Dial Lane Cottage` respectively, followed by the highway junction with a single unmade dirt track known as Knotty Lane, and beyond, by a large farm holding known as Dial Lane Farm.
Online historic OS mapping indicates that both this cottage group and Dial Lane farm were both built and present as at 1891.

To the West it is bordered by Public Footpath `Biddulph 93` and open farm and amenity land with a woodland edge tree row, followed by Dial Lane highway, beyond which, on the opposite side, is an agricultural holding known as `Dial Lane Grange`, and further beyond: rolling open farm and amenity land that gradually falls away, along with intermittent field margin and woodland edge tree groupings and rows.
Dial Lane Grange is a modern day addition to the historic locality and streetscene, being granted planning permission via planning appeal on the 19th February 1998.

6. **Design and Access Statement**

This planning application proposal submission seeks planning permission for a number of two and single storey extensions to the existing farmhouse accommodation, along with the construction of a replacement ancillary building and porch within its curtilage.

This planning application proposes:

A two storey rear (North) extension to the existing dwellinghouse, built adjacent to the same.

- The proposed extension will have a roof pitch to match the existing dwelling, as well as a matching eaves line, having a form and roofline that mirrors and respects that of the original, but will have modestly lower ridge height to the host property.
- The roof of the extension will run east/west with a modest pitched central roof link connecting it to the existing property.
- The extension will be inset from that of the host dwelling by some 0.5m at each end, in a subordinate complimentary manner.
- The extension is to be finished with materials of a similar appearance to that of the host dwelling, being of a stone and tile construction.
- The rear elevation of the extension will project a similar appearance to that of the existing host dwelling and its ground floor extension, with traditionally proportioned window openings at first floor, along with large expanse of glazing to ground floor.

Proposed is a two storey extension to the North rear elevation of the two storey part of the farmhouse of slightly larger outward proportions than that of its single storey ancillary building existing.
This Northern rear elevation side of the property is already characterised by built development, being that of the existing single storey ancillary building incorporating considerable expanse of glazing.

This proposed two storey rear extension would be largely concealed and being on the opposing side of the property to that of the primary heritage asset value, being the front elevation, this would not detract from or be detrimental to the same or its significance.
This proposed extension steps in from the rear elevation of the farmhouse at both rear corners, creating the same sense of subordinance, and natural evolution, in the historic context of the extent and proportion of that original two storey part of the farmhouse.
The existing expanse of glazing is replicated at ground floor with proposed patio door openings, along with window openings at first floor that are traditionally proportioned and when considered in the context of both this elevation and the property as a whole, are not considered to be a detrimental addition in this regard.

Overall, it is considered that both the design and appearance of these features would not detract from the general appearance or historic context of this property overall, and would enable expansion of the property in a manner that respects its position and heritage value.

It is acknowledged that either a two storey rear extension of near identical proportions or varying, more expansive forms of single storey rear extensions could be implemented via permitted development in accordance with the Order.
It is also acknowledged that in addition, either a single or twin tier two storey rear extension of near identical proportions or varying forms of single storey rear extensions to that proposed above, could also implemented via permitted development in accordance with the Order, to the rear of that

existing single storey element of the farmhouse, considerably increasing the additional built footprint at this location.

In addition: it is also acknowledged that, in addition, ancillary buildings could be erected in this location, between the existing built form and the North curtilage boundary, in accordance with the Order, that may result in detrimentally obscuring and detracting from that existing.

A single storey side (West) extension to the proposed two storey rear extension, built adjacent to the same.

- The proposed extension will have a roof pitch to principally, match the existing host dwelling, and near match that of the proposed rear extension, having a form and roofline that mirrors and respects both that of the original and proposed rear extension.
- The roof of this extension will run east/west connecting it to the proposed rear extension.
- The extension will be inset from that of the proposed rear extension by some 0.5m, in a further subordinate complimentary manner, which in turn is subordinate to the host dwelling.
- The extension is to be finished with materials of a similar appearance to that of the host dwelling, being of a stone and tile construction.
- The rear and side elevations of the extension will project a similar appearance to that of the existing host dwelling, and of that of the proposed rear extension with a traditionally proportioned window opening to its side elevation, along with a large expanse of glazing to its rear elevation.
- The extension will incorporate a conservation rooflight to both its rear and front facing roof slopes.

A further single storey side (West) extension to the existing dwellinghouse, built adjacent to the same.

- The proposed extension will have a roof pitch to principally, match the existing host dwelling, that of the proposed side extension, and near match that of the proposed rear extension, having a form and roofline that mirrors and respects both that of the original and proposed rear and side extensions.
- The roof of this extension will run east/west connecting it to the existing property and proposed side extension via a valley gutter.
- The extension will be inset from that of the existing dwelling side elevation by some 0.5m, in a further subordinate complimentary manner, which in turn is subordinate to the host dwelling.
- The extension is to be finished with materials of a similar appearance to that of the host dwelling, being of a stone and tile construction.
- The rear, side and front elevations of the extension will project a similar appearance to that of the existing host dwelling, and of that of the proposed rear and side extension with a traditionally proportioned window opening to its side elevation, a traditionally proportioned door opening to its rear elevation, along with a traditionally proportioned window opening to its front elevation.

In the overall context of this Western elevation, these proposed extensions would be complimentary additions that would be of a sympathetic design and appearance which would not detract from the general appearance or historic context of this property.
The proposed `twin` single storey extensions would far better respect and identify with the two storey above, including that of the proposed two storey rear extension, whether granted by consent or permitted development.
This better reflecting the character and form existing, as opposed to a single mono pitch extension as a potential design alternative.

It is acknowledged that a single storey side extension that would be taller than that existing and of a larger footprint area proportion to that of this proposal could be implemented via permitted development in accordance with the Order.
It is also acknowledged that either a single or two storey rear extension of near identical proportions or varying forms of single storey rear extensions could be implemented via permitted development in accordance with the Order, with their Western elevations being presented and visible to this aspect in a similar manner.
In addition: it is also acknowledged that, in addition, ancillary buildings could be erected in this location, between the existing built form and the West curtilage boundary, in accordance with the Order, that may result in detrimentally obscuring and detracting from that existing.

A replacement front (South) Porch to the existing dwellinghouse, built adjacent to the same.

- The proposed porch will have a roof pitch to principally, match the existing host dwelling, and near match that of the proposed extensions, having a form and roofline that mirrors and respects both that of the original and proposed extensions.
- The roof of this porch will run north/south connecting it to the existing dwelling.
- The porch will be centred along the front elevation in a manner, which is both complimentary and respectful to the existing dwelling.
- The porch is to be finished with materials of a similar appearance to that of the host dwelling, being of a stone and tile construction.
- The side and front elevations of the porch will project similar traditional proportions and appearance to that of the existing host dwelling.

Proposed is a replacement porch, which realigns to a more centralised position and is of slightly larger proportions than that existing.
The front of the farmhouse is already characterised by that of the existing porch of a similar style and form.
Whilst being of a slightly increased scale, this would be of a traditional stone, timber and tile construction and form that would be a complimentary addition that, when considered in the context of the frontage as a whole, would not detract from the general appearance or historic context of this property.
It is acknowledged that a replacement porch, albeit of slighter smaller proportion could be implemented via permitted development in accordance with the Order.

A further two storey side (East) extension to the existing dwellinghouse, built adjacent to the same.

- The proposed extension will have a roof pitch to near match the existing dwelling and proposed extensions, as well as a matching eaves line, having a form and roofline that mirrors and respects that of the original, but will have modestly lower ridge height to the host property.
- The roof of the extension will run east/west connecting it to the existing property.
- The extension will be inset from that of the host dwelling by some 0.6m at each end, in a subordinate complimentary manner.
- The extension is to be finished with materials of a similar appearance to that of the host dwelling, being of a stone and tile construction.
- The rear, side and front elevations of the extension will project a similar appearance to that of the existing host dwelling, and of that of the proposed rear and side extensions with, traditionally proportioned window openings at first floor, along with large expanse of glazing to ground floor.

Proposed is a two storey extension to the East side gable of the two storey part of the farmhouse of slightly larger proportions than that of its single storey part existing.

This Eastern side of the property is already characterised by that space between the East side two storey gable of the farmhouse and the parallel frontage agricultural building to the East being infilled with built development, being that of the existing single storey part of the original farmhouse and adjacent single storey ancillary building.
This Eastern side of the property is largely concealed from view in any direction by virtue of a mix of existing on-site buildings and vegetative boundary treatment of the farmhouse curtilage.

Whilst of a slightly increased two storey elevation and ridge height, this would be a complimentary addition that would be of a sympathetic design and appearance which would not detract from the general appearance or historic context of this property.
This existing single storey element steps back from that of its two storey neighbour at both front and rear corners, and it is proposed to retain these features, maintaining the same sense of subordinance, and natural evolution, in the historic context of the extent and proportion of that original two storey part of the farmhouse.
It proposes to create natural light glazed panelling at ground, and traditionally proportioned window openings at first floor.
Given the level of concealment of this aspect, and in the context of this elevation as a whole, these are not considered to be detrimental additions to the overall historic context of the property in this regard.

It is also proposed, whilst retaining that existing small single storey ancillary building, being that completely concealed between that existing single storey part of the original farmhouse and the parallel frontage agricultural building, to alter the same by amending the current mono pitch roof to a dual pitch, and to reconfigure the existing door opening.
These proposed alterations are considered to be complimentary additions that, when considered in the context of this elevation as a whole, would not detract from the general appearance or historic context of this property.

Taking all the above into account, it is not considered that the loss of that existing single storey part of the original farmhouse to facilitate this proposal would result in the detrimental loss of features or fabric that is fundamental to the significance of the heritage asset.

It is acknowledged that a single storey side extension that would be taller than that existing and of a larger footprint area proportion to that of this proposal could be implemented via permitted development in accordance with the Order.
This would not replace that existing single storey part of the existing farmhouse, yet would be in addition to, significantly increasing the mass and built footprint at this location.
In addition: it is also acknowledged that, in addition, a considerable expanse of ancillary buildings could be erected in this location, between the existing built form and the East curtilage boundary, in accordance with the Order, that may result in detrimentally obscuring and detracting from that existing.

<u>A replacement single storey ancillary garage/workshop building (East).</u>

- The proposed building will have a roof pitch to near match the existing dwelling and proposed extensions, having a form and roofline that mirrors and respects that of the original.
- The roof of the principal part of the building, being the garage, will run east/west, with that of the secondary, workshop part, being southeast/northwest.
- The building is to be finished with materials of a similar appearance to that of the host dwelling, and the approved replacement agricultural buildings, being a combination of an oak frame and horizontal timber boarding in part, and stone and tile construction in part.

Taking into account both the proposed position of this building in relation to the existing Farmhouse, its form, subservient nature and proposed construction materials, it is considered overall, that this would not have a detrimental impact upon the Heritage Asset or property overall.

It is also acknowledged that a considerable degree and scale of ancillary buildings are already present within the identified curtilage, and that, in addition, the volume could be considerably increased and implemented via permitted development in accordance with the Order.

A first floor side (West) elevation window to the existing dwellinghouse.

- The proposed window to the existing bathroom to the west side elevation of the existing dwellinghouse would constitute a traditionally proportioned window opening, being consistent with both those existing and proposed.

When considered in the overall context, it is not considered that this proposed additional window would be of detriment to the is elevation or the property as a whole, being of a traditional form and scale and introducing additional interest to what is otherwise, a blank elevation.

In addition:
This planning application also proposes to revise and improve the existing residential access arrangements to this property, in that, as displayed upon the enclosed plans:
Currently, the existing residential access driveway point, being the most Eastern one of the two overall, the other point to the West being the agricultural access point, accommodates a gate across its span only some 1.2m inset from the metalled highway.
Therefore, currently, a vehicle either accessing or egressing the property has to negotiate this gate resulting in a standing vehicle upon the highway upon either entering or leaving.
It is proposed, as displayed, to inset the access gate within the property to a point some 5m internal of the metalled highway, enabling a vehicle either entering or leaving the property to dispense with the opening or closing of this gate without infringement upon the highway, representing a considerable improvement to both the property and highway safety at this location.

Given the age of this property and, as stated, that its external walls are, on average, some 0.5m thick solid stone, these development proposals would provide a significant benefit and enable a higher degree of thermal efficiency to be achieved to three of the four compass point external elevations of the property.
This alone forms an important material consideration and also a contributory factor to very special circumstances should the Council be so minded to view this application submission in the negative.

In respect of public footpath “Biddulph Town 93”:
The rear elevation of not only the farmhouse dwelling but the near entirety of the farm and its mix of agricultural and ancillary buildings and existing built development present to the open countryside beyond to the North, with its Northern and Western aspects being those visible from the adjacent public footpath “Biddulph Town 93”.

The `top end`, Southernmost part of the farm, being that closest to and fronting Dial Lane, and that which Biddulph 93 runs closest to and alongside is therefore already characterised by established built form via this spread grouping of differing buildings.

When considered in its full context, of not only these submission development proposals in isolation, yet also of the recently approved planning permission to replace agricultural Building A with proportionately larger building, the soon to be submitted planning application for the proposed

relocation of Building B, and, as stated, and particularly the alternative development possibilities via permitted development, It is considered that these development proposals would not cause demonstrable harm to the character, appearance and heritage of this rural area, and thereby, adversely impact upon the public footpath or the enjoyment of the same.

These submission proposals have been carefully designed to not only be subordinate to that existing, but to also further compliment and create additional architectural interest to the same, which in turn does serve to enhance the walking experience of, what is already seen as a transitional sense of enclosure at this spot in the context of the wider footpath route.

It is not considered that these development proposals would have a materially greater impact upon the openness of the Green Belt, in that:
This proposal does not propose an increase to that existing residential curtilage,
The use of the existing farmhouse, ancillary buildings and the land around it is already domesticated, thus leading to no additional or significant encroachment of development into the Green Belt, or residual harmful effect on the openness of the Green Belt.
The form, bulk and general design of the extensions and buildings proposed, especially when considered in the full context of those permitted development alternatives, do not cause demonstrable harm to the visual amenities of their surroundings or of the Green Belt in general.

Scale of the Proposals.
The existing dwellinghouse, as set out by, and agreed with the Council in the context of the `original` dwelling, constitutes the two storey stone and tile farmhouse, and adjoining single storey stone and mono pitch roof part thereof to the East, together covering a footprint area of some 78.2 $m^2$.
In addition, the dwellinghouse curtilage accommodates some 168.70 $m^2$ of ancillary buildings.
Therefore: the existing combined (residential & ancillary) footprint area is some 246.90 $m^2$.
Cumulatively, the proposed two and single storey extensions and replacement porch would consist of a gross built footprint area of some 121.30 $m^2$.
This being a gross percentage increase over and above that existing of some 155.20%.

However, to implement these proposed extensions would involve the removal of that single storey (East) part of the existing dwellinghouse, of some 18.70 $m^2$.
(the existing porch footprint has not been included as a deduction at this stage, given that it does not form part of the agreed footprint area of the `original` dwelling).

Therefore, the proposed two and single storey extensions and replacement porch would consist of a net built footprint area of some 102.60 $m^2$.
This being a net percentage increase over and above that existing of some 131.30%.

In addition:
The proposed ancillary building would consist of a built footprint area of some 69.89 $m^2$.

Therefore:
The total combined (residential extension & ancillary) net built footprint area of the proposed development would amount to some 172.49 $m^2$.

However:
It is notable and relevant that: the combined (residential extension & ancillary) implementation of these proposals would result in the simultaneous removal of some 162.70 $m^2$ of existing ancillary building built footprint area, with this development proposal then resulting in a net built footprint

area (irrespective of whether residential or ancillary) increase, of only some 9.79 $m^2$ over and above that already existing.
In this context therefore, the degree of any perceived adverse impact upon the openness of the Green Belt is considerably minimised.

It is anticipated that the Council may ultimately view this planning application submission negatively against the provisions of Para 145(c) of The Framework, in that the proposed development would result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.

Should this be the case, it is considered that the owners have a legitimate fallback position under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended ("the Order"), being of sufficient weight to demonstrate very special circumstances, with this being a material consideration to this planning application submission.

As stated below and in the self titled section further below, further and separate representations will shortly be made to the Council, specifically in respect of the Permitted Development aspects of this matter, to seek to both clarify and formalise the same accordingly in this regard.

It is considered that alternative development via the provisions within the Order, as summarised below, when assessed as a whole and in the context of the overall potential impact upon both the existing property and the relevant aspects of the wider Green Belt, could be viewed to be more onerous than those proposals set out within this planning application, proposing not only a greater degree of built development, but such that is more sporadic and spread over a greater geographic area.

By comparison, this application proposal does offer a better, more compact design solution that is more in keeping with that existing and its historic and Green Belt setting.
On this basis, it is considered that the fall back position would have a significant detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area, whereas the proposed development will not. Such benefits are considered to carry significant weight in favour of the proposed development.

<u>Permitted Development:</u>
In the alternative context, and in anticipation that the Council may ultimately view this planning application submission negatively against the provisions of Para 145(c) of The Framework, in that the proposed development would result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building, it is considered that the owners have a legitimate fallback position under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended ("the Order"), being of sufficient weight to demonstrate very special circumstances.

Whilst a Permitted Development proposal would not be identical to, and involve a different type of development to that proposed within this submission, and whilst it would involve a reconfiguration of the internal layout to meet the accommodation requirements of the owners: should this planning application submission not be allowed, the owners, having already carefully considered alternative configuration, will proceed with and seek to construct such a proposal.

In brief:
Whilst this is covered in more detail in the relevant section below:
There are 3 potential differing Options:

Option 1:
Proposed residential extensions = 102.54 m2 (footprint increase of some 131.13%).
in addition to the 102.54 m2 proposed PD residential extensions, and existing 168.70m2 of ancillary buildings, a further and additional 215.96 m2 of PD ancillary buildings are allowable and proposed, equating to a total combined additional footprint of both proposed residential extensions and ancillary buildings of some 318.50 m2.

It is proposed that, in addition, all those existing ancillary buildings, save for an existing building of some $6m^2$ area, will be replaced with new ancillary buildings.
Therefore, in addition to that ancillary building retained, the total area of ancillary buildings proposed, made up of both new and replacement existing, equates to some $378.66m^2$.

Option 2:
Proposed residential extensions = 124.64 m2 (footprint increase of some 159.39%)
In addition to the 124.64 $m^2$ proposed PD residential extensions, and existing $168.70m^2$ of ancillary buildings, a further and additional 193.86 $m^2$ of PD ancillary buildings are allowable and proposed, equating to a total combined footprint of both proposed residential extensions and ancillary buildings of some 318.50 $m^2$.

It is proposed that, in addition, all those existing ancillary buildings, save for an existing building of some $6m^2$ area, will be replaced with new ancillary buildings.
Therefore, in addition to that ancillary building retained, the total area of ancillary buildings proposed, made up of both new and replacement existing, equates to some $356.56m^2$.

Option 3:
Proposed residential extensions = 172.24 m2 (footprint increase of some 220.26%)
it is proposed that, in addition, all those existing ancillary buildings, save for an existing building of some 6m2 area, will be replaced with new ancillary buildings.
Therefore, in addition to that ancillary building retained, the total area of ancillary buildings proposed, made up of both new and replacement existing, equates to some 308.96m2.

Overall:
It is considered that there is a certain historical precedent for the design and form of the extension additions proposed, in the way in which they would positively relate to the original farmhouse dwelling and the farmstead.
To that extent, it is considered that they would not appear as unusual or out of character with a dwelling within the rural area.

Whilst these proposed extensions would increase the expanse of built footprint to the existing dwelling, they would do so in a manner that is respectful to the host dwelling, and that is proportionate, especially when considered against the Permitted Development alternatives, when taken as a whole, which does include the provision for, in addition to overall more substantive residential extensions, a considerably larger expanse of additional ancillary building accommodation, together culminating in additions to the property curtilage that would be considerably more expansive in scale, and not necessarily as akin to that of the existing built design and form in this rural Green Belt location.

In formulating these detailed proposals, careful consideration has been given to appreciate the form and architecture of the existing dwellinghouse, and its existing ancillary buildings, along with its cumulative overall historic setting and built setting within both itself, and the wider context of its surrounds and Green Belt location.

Their design and appearance would relate well to the existing dwelling in a way that would respect its form, scale and character in a subordinate and complimentary manner.
This approach clearly displays homage and respect to the original host dwelling farmhouse and consciously avoids fully concealing the same, enabling the path of evolution of this dwelling to be both identified and catalogued.

This planning application submission is made subsequent to a previous application submission to the Council for a not dissimilar purpose: being on that occasion for both single and two storey extensions along with a replacement front porch, being that which was refused permission on the 7th May 2020.

It is recognised that the Local Authority is likely to consider the submitted proposal to constitute an inappropriate form of development within the Green Belt. It is nevertheless submitted that this proposal will have a considerably lesser impact on the Green Belt and the character and appearance of the area than the stated permitted development alternatives, and will enable a higher degree of thermal efficiency to be achieved.
These considerations are collectively considered to amount to very special circumstances to justify approval of the proposed development in the context of established Green Belt policy.
The proposed extensions are also considered to be of a scale, massing and design that are in keeping with the historical context, character and appearance of the host dwelling and that of the surrounding area, and will not materially detract from the amenity of any neighbouring occupiers.

This very matter of the consideration of whether there is a legitimate fallback position under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended ("the Order"), being of sufficient weight to demonstrate very special circumstances, being a material consideration to a planning application submission, was recently considered by Mr Inspector Hartley in the matter of the following:
Planning Appeal Reference: APP/B3438/D/20/3251032 – White Chimneys, Devils Lane, Longsdon, ST9 9QR, with this Appeal being allowed via decision notice on the 8th July 2020.

Whilst the specific circumstances and/or merits of that particular case are a consideration for that matter alone, the following wider points were clearly defined and set out by Mr Inspector Hartley, which are relevant to this planning application submission:

Here:
The applicant proposed an extension to their property in the Green Belt.
The Council considered it to be contrary to the Local Plan and provisions of Para 145(c) of The Framework, in that the proposed development would result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.
The applicant asserted that Permitted Development Prior Approval consent for an alternate extension, along with thermal efficiency benefits arising from the proposed development, together constituted very special circumstances.
Mr Inspector Hartley agreed with the applicant.

In finding that proposal to be contrary to the Local Plan and provisions of Para 145(c) of The Framework, being found to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, Mr Inspector Hartley asserted that "substantial weight" was afforded to the fallback position as to the existence of permitted development right for alternative development, also recognising thermal efficiency benefits as a positive contributory factor.

In conclusion:
Mr Inspector Hartley determined on balance: that the substantial weight to be given to the Green Belt harm arising from the proposal would be clearly outweighed by the other identified considerations sufficient to demonstrate very special circumstances. Given this overall finding, the proposal would not conflict with Green Belt policy in the Framework, or policies within the existing and emerging Local Plan.

The comparison and relevance to this development proposal is clear, defined and self explanatory.

As stated, in addition to this planning application submission, enclosing detail and reference to the alternate permitted development position in respect of this property, further submissions will shortly be made to both clarify and formalise this position accordingly.

## 7. Heritage Statement

**Introduction**

Smithy Farm is classified as a non designated Heritage Asset, being listed within the Staffordshire Historic Environment Record ("HER") under listing reference no.: MST21919, as a Historic Farmstead. (a copy of the HER listing entry is provided at Appendix 1).

The HER record entry setting out that:
"One of a cluster of farms on Dial Lane, Biddulph.
Smithy Farm is laid out around a loose, three-sided yard with detached farmhouse set long side on to the yard.
The farmstead is shown on the earlier 19th century 1" Ordnance Survey mapping, and may even be indicated on William Yates' map of Staffordshire (1775)."

Earliest available online historic OS mapping first denotes this property as built and present in 1891. However, it is recognised that the above HER entry does appear to suggest reference that this property may originate from a date somewhat earlier.

Earliest available online historic OS mapping denotes the following:

- 1891: denotes the presence of Smithy Farm, its stone & tile farmhouse, stone curtilage wall and two stone & tile agricultural buildings parallel to Dial Lane.
  It further denotes the presence of the Public Footpath ` Biddulph 93` to the West, the barn directly opposite to the South, the row of three stone 7 tile terrace cottages to the South Southeast, known as `Ivy Cottage`, `Yoxholme`, and `Dial Lane Cottage` respectively.

  (The detached barn opposite referred to currently presents a modern day brick and tile construction, using modern era facing bricks.
  It is understood yet unconfirmed that, originally, this historic barn was more in keeping with its historic surrounds in that it too was of a fully stone and tile construction, yet, apparently, following a road traffic accident which collided with this building and part demolished the same, it was re-built with modern day materials, believed to be circa 2002.
  It is understood, yet also unconfirmed due to the constraints of access onto privately owned land that this barn does still retain its original stone wall elevation to the South).

- 1898: denotes the presence of all of the above.
  This is a clearer image and aside from the above, also shows the following:
  The `original` dwelling in full, including the single storey element to the East,
  Ancillary building to the West elevation of the farmhouse,
  Footpath `Biddulph 93` denoted as `F.P.`.
- 1899: denotes the presence of all of the above.
- 1900: denotes the presence of all of the above.
- 1910: denotes the presence of all of the above.
- 1926: denotes the presence of all of the above.
- 1945- 47: denotes the presence of all of the above.
- 1954: denotes the presence of all of the above.

- 1964: denotes the presence of all of the above.
  Aside from the above, this also shows the following:
  Ancillary curtilage buildings to the East,
  Agricultural `Building B` within the open farmland to the North.

No further entries available.

The property is the subject of an entry listing within the Staffordshire HER, including a number of early buildings which have remained largely untouched, or improved, since their 19th century construction.
In this context, it has a degree of historic value as a non designated asset, contributing towards both its local and wider historic and rural environment.

The key historic feature and main heritage asset value of this property is its frontage to Dial Lane and the wider street scene, and its presentation to the same.
The double fronted stone and tile farmhouse, set back from the two stone and tile agricultural buildings that are situated at right angles to the same, parallel to Dial Lane at and very close to the highway edge, either side of it, create and establish a clear historic setting and sense of enclosure, which in turn, gives a real sense of its era, age and purpose.

The property achieves this in a very simple and understated manner, and although perhaps unintended at that time, being almost certainly set out of functionality, it does so very effectively. Here, the proportions of these three key buildings in themselves are of a lesser relevance, with the simple form and design style, along with their positioning and orientation that primarily contributes to this sense and character.

Whilst the wider historic context is generically visible and present across other aspects of the property, including the rear, the degree of historic interest and quality is a lesser one by comparison.

**Assessment of Impact**
This application submission proposes extension to this property upon three sides, along with a replacement porch to the front elevation:

<u>To the (South) front:</u>
Proposed is a replacement porch, which realigns to a more centralised position and is of slightly larger proportions than that existing.
The front of the farmhouse is already characterised by that of the existing porch of a similar style and form.

Whilst being of a slightly increased scale, this would be of a traditional stone, timber and tile construction and form that would be a complimentary addition that, when considered in the context of the frontage as a whole, would not detract from the general appearance or historic context of this property.
(It is acknowledged that a replacement porch, albeit of slighter smaller proportion could be implemented via permitted development in accordance with the Order).

Proposed is a single storey extension to the West side two storey gable of the farmhouse of slightly larger proportions that that of the single storey ancillary building existing.
The front of the property is already characterised by that space between the West side two storey gable of the farmhouse and the parallel frontage agricultural building to the West being infilled with built development, being that of the existing single storey ancillary building.

Whilst of a slightly increased elevation and ridge height, this would not extend to the West farther than that of the footprint of the existing ancillary building, and would be a complimentary addition that would be of a sympathetic design and appearance which would not detract from the general appearance or historic context of this property.

The existing ancillary building front elevation mirrors that of the principal elevation of the farmhouse, presenting a continuous built form across its entire expanse, concealing for its part, the corner extent of the original farmhouse.
This proposed extension by comparison, steps back from the same, creating a greater sense of subordinance, and natural evolution, clearly revealing and defining the extent and proportion of the original farmhouse.
Whilst a window opening is proposed to the front elevation of this extension, it is a traditionally proportioned window opening and when considered in the context of the frontage as a whole, is not considered to be a detrimental addition in this regard.
(It is acknowledged that a single storey extension that would be taller than that existing and of a greater footprint area and near same ridge height could be implemented via permitted development in accordance with the Order).

Proposed is a two storey extension to the East side gable of the two storey part of the farmhouse of slightly larger proportions than that of its single storey part existing.
The front of the property is already characterised by that small space between the East side two storey gable of the farmhouse and the parallel frontage large scale agricultural building to the East being infilled with built development, being that of the existing single storey part of the original farmhouse.

Whilst of a slightly increased two storey elevation and ridge height, this would be a complimentary addition that would be of a sympathetic design and appearance which would not detract from the general appearance or historic context of this property.
This existing single storey element steps back from that of its two storey neighbour, and it is proposed to retain this feature, maintaining the same sense of subordinance, and natural evolution, in the historic context of the extent and proportion of the original two storey part of the farmhouse.
It proposes to maintain the existing ground floor opening to the same proportion, and whilst proposing a window opening at first floor, it is a traditionally proportioned window opening and when considered in the context of the frontage as a whole, is not considered to be a detrimental addition in this regard.
The existing parallel frontage agricultural building to the East is of a scale, being in effect two storey. Given this and that it is of a parallel orientation, the vast majority of this proposed extension is concealed, with little built form visible.

Whilst the proposed roofline would slightly extend beyond that of this existing building, this is not seen as a detrimental factor, in that this does positively mirrors and respects those existing, and does positively introduce a more natural stepping of the same from this agricultural building to that two storey part of the original farmhouse.
(It is acknowledged that, whilst not yet proposed at this stage, a two storey rear extension of near identical proportion to that of this proposal could be implemented, in accordance with the provisions of the Order, to that existing single storey East part of the original farmhouse, which, whilst being further set back, would result in a near similar built outcome and impact).
(It is also acknowledged that, in addition to, and adjacent to this existing single storey part of the original farmhouse, a further single storey extension could be implemented via permitted development in accordance with the Order that would be taller than that existing, and extend to the East beyond the frontage screen of the existing parallel frontage agricultural building).

To the East side:
Proposed is a two storey extension to the East side gable of the two storey part of the farmhouse of slightly larger proportions than that of its single storey part existing.
This Eastern side of the property is already characterised by that space between the East side two storey gable of the farmhouse and the parallel frontage agricultural building to the East being infilled with built development, being that of the existing single storey part of the original farmhouse and adjacent single storey ancillary building.
This Eastern side of the property is largely concealed from view in any direction by virtue of a mix of existing on-site buildings and vegetative boundary treatment of the farmhouse curtilage.

Whilst of a slightly increased two storey elevation and ridge height, this would be a complimentary addition that would be of a sympathetic design and appearance which would not detract from the general appearance or historic context of this property.
This existing single storey element steps back from that of its two storey neighbour at both front and rear corners, and it is proposed to retain these features, maintaining the same sense of subordinance, and natural evolution, in the historic context of the extent and proportion of that original two storey part of the farmhouse.
It proposes to create natural light glazed panelling at ground, and traditionally proportioned window openings at first floor.
Given the level of concealment of this aspect, and in the context of this elevation as a whole, these are not considered to be detrimental additions to the overall historic context of the property in this regard.

It is also proposed, whilst retaining that existing small single storey ancillary building, being that completely concealed between that existing single storey part of the original farmhouse and the parallel frontage agricultural building, to alter the same by amending the current mono pitch roof to a dual pitch, and to reconfigure the existing door opening.
These proposed alterations are considered to be complimentary additions that, when considered in the context of this elevation as a whole, would not detract from the general appearance or historic context of this property.

The East side elevation of the proposed two storey rear extension would also be visible to this aspect.
However, given the level of concealment of this side of the property, and that, whilst proposing window openings at both ground and first floor, these are all traditionally proportioned, that this would be of a sympathetic design and appearance which would not detract from the general appearance or historic context of this property overall.

Taking all the above into account, it is not considered that the loss of that existing single storey part of the original farmhouse to facilitate this proposal would result in the detrimental loss of features or fabric that is fundamental to the significance of the heritage asset.
(It is acknowledged that a single storey side extension that would be taller than that existing and of a larger footprint area proportion to that of this proposal could be implemented via permitted development in accordance with the Order).
(It is also acknowledged that either a single or twin tier two storey rear extension of near identical proportions or varying forms of single storey rear extensions could be implemented via permitted development in accordance with the Order, with their Eastern elevations being presented and visible to this aspect in a similar manner).

To the West side:
Proposed is a single storey extension to the West side two storey gable of the farmhouse of slightly larger proportions that that of the single storey ancillary building existing.
This Western gable side of the property is already characterised by built development, being that of the existing single storey ancillary building.

Whilst of a slightly increased elevation and ridge height, this would not extend to the West farther than that of the footprint of the existing ancillary building, and would be a complimentary addition that would be of a sympathetic design and appearance which would not detract from the general appearance or historic context of this property.
Unlike that of the existing ancillary building, this proposed extension would step back from that of its two storey neighbour at both front and rear corners, creating a greater sense of subordinance, and natural evolution, in the historic context of the extent and proportion of that original two storey part of the farmhouse.

Whilst a window and door openings are proposed to the West elevation of this extension, they are traditionally proportioned and when considered in the context of both this elevation and the property as a whole, are not considered to be a detrimental addition in this regard.
(It is acknowledged that a single storey extension that would be taller than that existing and of a greater footprint area and near same ridge height could be implemented via permitted development in accordance with the Order).

Also proposed is a first floor side window opening to the existing West two storey gable of the original farmhouse.
The proposed window would constitute a traditionally proportioned window opening, being consistent with both those existing and proposed, that would not detract from the general appearance or historic context of this property.

Also proposed is a second single storey side extension to this Western side elevation, attached to the proposed two storey rear extension, that would be situate to the North, being directly adjacent to and behind that above.
This also proposes a window opening to its Western elevation that is traditionally proportioned, which, when considered in the context of both this elevation and the property as a whole, is not considered to be a detrimental addition in this regard.
This would be of an identical ridge height yet of a lesser Westerly projection that that above, and as such, would be largely screened by the same.
This stepped back corner feature, along with that further proposed step back with the proposed two storey rear extension at its rear corner not only creates further architectural interest yet also contributes toward an enhanced sense of subordinance, and natural evolution, in the historic context of the extent and proportion of that original Western two storey elevation of the farmhouse and property overall.

The West side elevation of the proposed two storey rear extension would also be visible to this aspect.
However, this would be of a sympathetic design and appearance which would not detract from the general appearance or historic context of this property overall.

In the overall context of this Western elevation, these proposed extensions would be complimentary additions that would be of a sympathetic design and appearance which would not detract from the general appearance or historic context of this property.

(It is acknowledged that a single storey side extension that would be taller than that existing and of a larger footprint area proportion to that of this proposal could be implemented via permitted development in accordance with the Order).
(It is also acknowledged that either a single or two storey rear extension of near identical proportions or varying forms of single storey rear extensions could be implemented via permitted development in accordance with the Order, with their Western elevations being presented and visible to this aspect in a similar manner).

To the (North) rear:
Proposed is a two storey extension to the North rear elevation of the two storey part of the farmhouse of slightly larger outward proportions than that of its single storey ancillary building existing.
This Northern rear elevation side of the property is already characterised by built development, being that of the existing single storey ancillary building incorporating considerable expanse of glazing.

This proposed two storey rear extension would be largely concealed and being on the opposing side of the property to that of the primary heritage asset value, being the front elevation, this would not detract from or be detrimental to the same or its significance.
This proposed extension steps in from the rear elevation of the farmhouse at both rear corners, creating the same sense of subordinance, and natural evolution, in the historic context of the extent and proportion of that original two storey part of the farmhouse.
The existing expanse of glazing is replicated at ground floor with proposed patio door openings, along with window openings at first floor that are traditionally proportioned and when considered in the context of both this elevation and the property as a whole, are not considered to be a detrimental addition in this regard.

This theme is replicated upon the rear elevation of the proposed two storey extension to the East side gable of the farmhouse.
As stated, this Eastern side of the property is largely concealed from view in any direction, and would be further concealed by virtue of either this planning application submission or as a result of a two storey Permitted Development rear extension.

This theme is further replicated upon the rear of the proposed rear most single storey extension to the proposed rear extension upon the West side of the farmhouse.
Further, a door entry of traditional proportions is also proposed within the rear elevation of the sister forward most proposed single storey side extension upon the West side of the farmhouse.

Overall, it is considered that both the design and appearance of these features would not detract from the general appearance or historic context of this property overall.

(It is acknowledged that either a single or two storey rear extension of near identical proportions or varying, more expansive forms of single storey rear extensions could be implemented via permitted development in accordance with the Order).

To the North East
In addition, a single storey detached combination garage/workshop outbuilding is proposed.

Taking into account both the proposed position of this building in relation to the existing Farmhouse, its form, subservient nature and proposed construction materials, it is considered overall, that this would not have a detrimental impact upon the Heritage Asset overall.

(It is also acknowledged that a considerable degree and scale of ancillary buildings are already present within the identified curtilage, and that, in addition, the volume could be considerably increased and implemented via permitted development in accordance with the Order).

**Mitigation**
It is considered that there is a certain historical precedent for the design and form of the extension additions proposed, in the way in which they would positively relate to the original dwelling and the farmstead overall.
To that extent, it is considered that they would not appear as unusual or out of character with a dwelling within the rural area.
In this instance: It is considered that these extension proposals would not detract from or be detrimental to the significance of the heritage asset; and that the design and form of these proposals: insomuch as they would contrast with this and other buildings in the area, would not make a negative impact on the asset.

Overall, it is considered that the level of the impact of the proposed development upon the non designated heritage asset is minimal, and it will not adversely impact upon this and its settings. This proposal would further add to and enhance the quality of both itself and its surroundings, and thus positively contribute to the overall character, appearance and well being of the local area and the property as a whole.
It is therefore considered that a mitigation strategy is not necessary.

In considering these proposals and reaching these conclusions, consideration is given to the alternate possibilities of permitted development that may be implemented as an alternative option, and the potential impact of such proposals by comparison on the property overall should these proposals not prevail.

8. **Permitted Development**

As is self evident by this planning application submission: the owners are seeking planning permission for the proposals as submitted to you.

However, in the alternative context, and in anticipation that the Council may ultimately view this planning application submission negatively against the provisions of Para 145(c) of The Framework, in that the proposed development would result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building, it is considered that the owners have a legitimate fallback position under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended ("the Order"), being of sufficient and substantial weight to demonstrate very special circumstances.

Whilst a Permitted Development proposal would not be identical to, and involve a different type of development to that proposed within this submission, and whilst it would involve a reconfiguration of the internal layout to meet the accommodation requirements of the owners: should this planning application submission not be allowed, the owners, having already carefully considered alternative configuration, will proceed with and seek to construct such a proposal.

Part 1 of Schedule 2 to the Order sets out the permitted development rules concerning what enlargements, improvements, alterations and other additions a householder may make to their house and the curtilage area around it without the need for an application for planning permission.

In this context, aside from other aspects, the Order provides for some three alternative possibilities in respect of a rear extension, one of which requiring Prior Approval consent.
On this basis, there are three alternative `options` in respect of Permitted Development for consideration, which for the purposes of this matter are entitled `Options 1, 2, and 3`.

Both in anticipation of a potential negative determination of this submission, and also to formalise the stated fallback position: in addition to this planning application submission, three further submissions will shortly be made to the Council in respect of these Options, being:

<u>Permitted Development – Planning Enquiry – Proposed Extensions & Alterations (Option 1)</u>
In accordance with those rights set out in the Order, this constitutes the following:

- A porch to the principal (front / South elevation) of the original dwelling = 3 $m^2$,
- A single storey side extension to the East elevation of the original dwelling = 32.74 $m^2$,
- A single storey side extension to the West elevation of the original dwelling = 41.30 $m^2$,
- A two storey 3m rear extension to the rear (North) elevation of the original dwelling = 25.50 $m^2$, (Applies to the existing two storey rear elevation of the `original` dwelling only at this stage). (In accordance with the Order, this two storey 3m rear extension could also be extended across to the East, to the rear of that existing single storey part of the original farmhouse).

- Additional and replacement ancillary buildings.

<u>Permitted Development – Planning Enquiry - Proposed Extensions & Alterations (Option 2)</u>
In accordance with those rights set out in the Order, this constitutes the following:

- A porch to the principal (front / South elevation) of the original dwelling = 3 $m^2$,
- A single storey side extension to the East elevation of the original dwelling = 32.74 $m^2$,
- A single storey side extension to the West elevation of the original dwelling = 41.30 $m^2$,
- A single storey 4m rear extension to the rear (North) elevation of the original dwelling = 47.60 $m^2$.

- Additional and replacement ancillary buildings.

Permitted Development – Prior Approval Application - `Larger Home` Extension (Option 3)
In accordance with those rights set out in the Order, this constitutes the following:

- A porch to the principal (front / South elevation) of the original dwelling = 3 $m^2$,
- A single storey side extension to the East elevation of the original dwelling = 32.74 $m^2$,
- A single storey side extension to the West elevation of the original dwelling = 41.30 $m^2$,
- A single storey `Larger Home' 8m rear extension to the rear (North) elevation of the original dwelling = 95.20 $m^2$.

  This Prior Approval application solely concerns itself with the rear extension, yet additional information is provided alongside, to set out how such an extension would form part of the overall Option 3.

- Additional and replacement ancillary buildings.

In terms of this planning application submission:
These submission proposals: for the proposed two and single storey extensions and replacement porch would consist of a net built footprint area of some 102.60 $m^2$, being a net percentage increase over and above that existing of some 131.30%.
These also propose an ancillary consisting of a built footprint area of some 69.89 $m^2$.
Together, the total combined (residential extension & ancillary) net built footprint area of the proposed development would amount to some 172.49 $m^2$.

However, the implementation of these proposals would result in the simultaneous removal of some 162.70 $m^2$ of existing ancillary building built footprint area, thus resulting in a net built footprint area (irrespective of whether residential or ancillary) increase, of only some 9.79 $m^2$ over and above that already existing overall.

In terms of the three `Option` Permitted Development proposals:
By comparison, the alternate Permitted Development `Option` proposals consist of the following built footprint area increases:

Option 1:
A net built footprint area of some 102.54 $m^2$, being a net percentage increase over and above that existing of some 131.13%.

Option 2:
A net built footprint area of some 124.64 $m^2$, being a net percentage increase over and above that existing of some 159.39%.

Option 3:
A net built footprint area of some 172.24 $m^2$, being a net percentage increase over and above that existing of some 220.26%.

Therefore:
Whilst this application submission proposes a net residential footprint area increase of 102.60 $m^2$, being a 131.30% increase, which, combined with the proposed 69.89 $m^2$ ancillary building, totals a proposed 172.49 $m^2$, it is mitigated and offset by the simultaneous removal of 162.70 $m^2$ of ancillary buildings: resulting in an overall combined net footprint area increase of 9.79 $m^2$.

In contrast, as displayed, each of the above three Permitted Development Options result in a considerably higher degree of additional built development by comparison.

In addition:
Each Permitted Development Option also proposes “additional & replacement ancillary buildings”.

In accordance with those rights set out in the Order:
The total area of ground around the house covered by buildings, enclosures and containers must not exceed 50% of the total area of the curtilage, excluding the original house. The 50% limit covers all buildings, so will include any existing or proposed new extensions to the original house under the permitted development rules or that have been granted planning permission, as well as existing and proposed outbuildings.
It does exclude the area covered by the original house, but does include any separate detached buildings.

Therefore, in the context of this proposal:
The extent of the curtilage of the dwellinghouse is that physically defined by a stone wall which does encircle the same in an arc almost semicircular shape, clearly separating it from the remainder of the agricultural holding, with Dial Lane highway representing the Southern boundary, and the stone wall encompassing that of the North, East and West boundaries.
This does include and encompass the Farmhouse and a number of ancillary buildings within its envelope, being all that denoted upon the enclosed Location plan by the Red edge line.

- The total curtilage area of the dwellinghouse, being all that within the Red line as defined and identified upon the enclosed Location plan = 1,052.60 $m^2$.
- The existing `original` dwellinghouse = 78.2 $m^2$
- 1,052.60 – 78.2 (total curtilage minus existing original dwelling) = 974.40 $m^2$ net curtilage area.
- 974.40 divided by 2 (50% of net curtilage area) = 487.20 $m^2$.
- Existing ancillary buildings = 168.70 $m^2$.
- 487.20 – 168.70 (50% of net curtilage area minus existing ancillary buildings) = 318.50 $m^2$.

Therefore:
In accordance with the Order:
In addition to any existing ancillary buildings: a total of some 318.50 $m^2$ of combined PD residential extensions & PD ancillary buildings can be erected within the curtilage of the dwellinghouse.

In terms of the three `Option` Permitted Development proposals:

Option 1:
318.50 – 102.54 (combined PD allowance minus proposed PD residential extensions) = 215.96 $m^2$.

Therefore, in this Option 1 scenario: in addition to the 102.54 $m^2$ proposed PD residential extensions, and existing 168.70$m^2$ of ancillary buildings, a further and additional 215.96 $m^2$ of PD ancillary buildings are allowable and proposed, equating to a total combined additional footprint of both proposed residential extensions and ancillary buildings of some 318.50 $m^2$.

Option 2:
318.50 – 124.64 (combined PD allowance minus proposed PD residential extensions) = 193.86 $m^2$.

Therefore, in this Option 2 scenario: in addition to the 124.64 $m^2$ proposed PD residential extensions, and existing 168.70$m^2$ of ancillary buildings, a further and additional 193.86 $m^2$ of PD ancillary buildings are allowable and proposed, equating to a total combined footprint of both proposed residential extensions and ancillary buildings of some 318.50 $m^2$.

Option 3:
318.50 – 172.24 (combined PD allowance minus proposed PD residential extensions) = 146.26 $m^2$.

Therefore, in this overall potential Option 3 scenario: in addition to the 172.24 $m^2$ proposed PD residential extensions, and existing 168.70$m^2$ of ancillary buildings, a further and additional 146.26 $m^2$ of PD ancillary buildings are allowable and proposed, equating to a total combined footprint of both proposed residential extensions and ancillary buildings of some 318.50 $m^2$.

## 9. **Conclusions**

In this matter, and on balance:
This planning application proposal submission seeks planning permission for a number of two and single storey extensions to the existing farmhouse accommodation, along with the construction of a replacement ancillary building and porch within its curtilage.

It is considered that there is a certain historical precedent for the design and form of the extension additions proposed, in the way in which they would positively relate to the original farmhouse dwelling and the farmstead.
To that extent, it is considered that they would not appear as unusual or out of character with a dwelling within the rural area.

In this instance: It is considered that these extension proposals would not detract from or be detrimental to the significance of the heritage asset; and that the design and form of these proposals: insomuch as they would contrast with this and other buildings in the area, would not make a negative impact on the asset.

It is recognised that the Council is likely to consider the submitted proposal to constitute an inappropriate form of development within the Green Belt.
It is nevertheless submitted that this proposal will have a considerably lesser impact on the Green Belt and the character and appearance of the area than the stated permitted development alternatives, and will enable a higher degree of thermal efficiency to be achieved.
These considerations are collectively considered to amount to very special circumstances to justify approval of the proposed development in the context of established Green Belt policy.
The proposed extensions are also considered to be of a scale, massing and design that are in keeping with the historical context, character and appearance of the host dwelling and that of the surrounding area, and will not materially detract from the amenity of any neighbouring occupiers.

These proposals, in a highway context represent a considerable improvement to both the property and highway safety at this location.

When considered in its full context, of not only these submission development proposals in isolation, yet also of the recently approved planning permission to replace agricultural Building A with proportionately larger building, the soon to be submitted planning application for the proposed relocation of Building B, and, as stated, and particularly the alternative development possibilities via permitted development, It is considered that these development proposals would not cause demonstrable harm to the character, appearance and heritage of this rural area, and thereby, would not adversely impact upon the public footpath “Biddulph 93” or the enjoyment of the same.

Overall, it is considered that the level of the impact of the proposed development upon the non designated heritage asset is minimal, and it will not adversely impact upon this and its settings.
This proposal would further add to and enhance the quality of both itself and its surroundings, and thus positively contribute to the overall character, appearance and well being of the local area and the property as a whole.

## 10. Appendix 1

**Staffordshire Historic Environment Record entry: Smithy Farm**

Heritage Gateway
Staffordshire Historic Environment Record (HER) Entry = Smithy Farm

**Staffordshire HER**

### Record Details

**MonUID:** MST21919
**HER Number:** 57808
**Type of record:** Monument
**Name:** Smithy Farm, Dial Lane, Biddulph

### Summary

One of a cluster of farms on Dial Lane, Biddulph. Smithy Farm is laid out around a loose, three-sided yard with detached farmhouse set long side on to the yard. The farmstead appears to have been extant by at least the later 18th-early 19th century and is still extant.

**Grid Reference:** SJ 8993 6203
**Map Sheet:** SJ86SE
**Parish:** Biddulph, Staffordshire Moorlands District
**Map:** Show location on Streetmap

### Monument Type(s):

- FARMSTEAD (Established, Georgian to INDUSTRIAL - 1775 AD? to 1834 AD (pre))

### Full description

One of a cluster of farms on Dial Lane, Biddulph. Smithy Farm is laid out around a loose, three-sided yard with detached farmhouse set long side on to the yard. (HP, 15-May-2014) <1>

The farmstead is shown on the earlier 19th century 1" Ordnance Survey mapping, and may even be indicated on William Yates' map of Staffordshire (1775). (HP, 15-May-2014) <2> <3>

The farmstead is still extant. (HP, 15-May-2014) <4>

### Sources and further reading


<1> SST87 - Digital Archive: Bob Edwards (Forum Heritage Services). 2008. Historic Farmsteads and Landscape Character in Staffordshire - GIS Data. 265163.

<2> SST3657 - Cartographic: David and Charles (Publisher). 1970. Ordnance Survey 1834-1836 1" Maps. Paper. 1" to a mile. Sheet 27 - Bixton.

<3> SST229 - Cartographic: William Yates (The Staffordshire Record Society). 1775/1984. A Map of the County of Stafford - by William Yates. Paper. 1" to 1 mile.

<4> SST4433 - Aerial Photograph: 2006-2010. Aerial photosurvey of Staffordshire - 2006-2010. Digital. 1:10000. 2006.

11. **Appendix 2**

**Planning Application Submission – Document List**

1. Planning Application Form,
2. Design and Access Statement,
3. Location, Site, and Roof Plans – Drawing Ref: 20/01/04D
4. Ancillary Building – Floorplan, Elevations, and Site Plan – Drawing Ref: 20/01/09A
5. Existing Survey Plan – Drawing Ref: 20/01/01
6. Proposed Extensions & Alterations – Floorplans & Elevations Plan – Drawing Ref: 20/01/02D.