DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2020/0525 **Valid 01/10/2020**	**MOUNT PLEASANT FARM BUNGALOW CAVERSWALL COMMON LANE CAVERSWALL**	**PROPOSED REAR EXTENSION WITH 2 NO DORMER WINDOWS AND PRIVATE TERRACE.** **(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)**

MAIN ISSUES

Whether or not the proposal amounts to inappropriate development in the Green Belt
The impact on the character and appearance of the area
The impact on residential amenity

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The site is approx. a mile to the north of Caverswall village in a rural area known as Caverswall Common and comprises a detached two-storey chalet bungalow reached via a long farm track connected to Caverswall Common road to the north. There is an adjacent neighbouring dwelling to the south but the rest of the surrounding land comprises open fields and is fairly flat. The site is also in the Green Belt.

PROPOSAL

This is a full householder planning application for a single-storey extension to the rear of the rear wing of the L-shaped dwelling, spanning the whole rear wall of the wing and projecting out by 1.8 metres. Above this, would be the replacement of the two existing dormer windows with larger dormer windows, one of which would have a balcony in front.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Staffs Moorlands Local Plan (adopted September 2020)

SS10 – Other Rural Areas Strategy
DC1 – Design Considerations

NPPF (Revised February 2019)

Sections 12 (Design) and 13 (Green Belts).

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

09/00660: Additions to the dwelling including extension of the roof. Approved and built.

78/05133/OLD: Extension to the neighbouring dwelling to the south. Approved.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 5.11.20
Neighbour consultation period ends: 5.11.20
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

None.

Town / Parish Comments

Not object.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Policy SS10, the strategy for the countryside, requires strict control over inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The NPPF defines inappropriate development, considering it harmful to the Green Belt but also lists in paras 145 and 146 the forms of development which are, exceptionally, not deemed to be inappropriate. This includes extensions to buildings providing they would not result in the disproportionate enlargement of the original building.

The dwelling has been extended before resulting in extensions/additions to the roof leading to the increase in the volume of the original building by 11% which is not considered to be a disproportionate enlargement. The proposed single-storey extension of part of the original L-shaped form of the dwelling (the current footprint remains the same as when first built) and replacement dormer windows even when considered cumulatively with the previous additions approved in 2009 would not amount to a disproportionate increase in the size of the original dwelling and therefore the proposal is not considered to harm the openness of the Green Belt and therefore the principle of the proposal complies with the Green Belt policies in the NPPF.

With regard to the particular design of the extensions, the dormer windows, despite the increased projection from the roof slope, would retain an appropriate width and height in relation to the size of the roof slope and would not harmfully dominate the rear elevation of the rear wing of the house in relation to the scale and form of the current dormers. The pitched roof design of the dormers would also be retained and this harmonises with the pitched roof design of the house. The right dormer cutting into the roof to provide patio doors and a balcony with balustrading are new features of the house and increases prominence in relation to the existing dormer. The bi-fold doors on the single-storey extension is also a feature not in common with the rest of

the fenestration of the house. The extension would also lead to an asymmetrical side gable to the rear wing as the proposed roof slope would be a lower pitch to the one at the front. However, on balance the proposal would not significantly harm the appearance of the dwelling as the south side elevation and rear east-facing elevation of the rear wing of the dwelling are not visible from the public realm or from the farm access road. The south elevation of the wing is obscured by the adjacent rear/north elevation of the neighbouring dwelling and the rear/east elevation of the wing is on the opposite side of the farm access track and there are no nearby roads or public footpaths to the east.

With regard to residential amenity, it is noted that the rear wall of the adjacent dwelling faces the side of the rear wing of the house from a very close distance and also overshadows the rear garden of the dwelling on site. However, there is only one first-floor window on the rear elevation of the adjacent dwelling and this is a bathroom windows and not a window to a habitable room. The proposal, despite pushing the rear elevation of the rear wing forward further obscuring the neighbouring bathroom windows would not lead to a harmful overshadowing of loss of light provision to the neighbouring dwelling to the extent that the living conditions of the occupants would be significantly harmed. Furthermore, although a balcony would be introduced into the new roofslope, there would be no overlooking into the habitable rooms of the house (due to the side window serving a bathroom and the oblique line of sight backwards from the balcony towards this window) or the garden area of the neighbouring house which lies to the front of the house, which is to the south, to the other side of the neighbouring house. There are no other nearby residential properties outside of the site and therefore the residential amenities would not be harmed by the proposal.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The proposal is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt and the design would not harm the visual or residential amenities of the area. The proposal therefore complies with the Council's adopted Local Plan and the government planning guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : APPROVE

Case Officer: Chris Johnston
Recommendation Date: 30.11.20

X B.J. Haywood

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council