

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2022/0109
Valid 30/03/2022

STEINFIELDS FARM
BROAD LANE
BROWN EDGE

**NEW REAR EXTENSION TO
REPLACE EXISTING,
ALTERATIONS TO SINGLE
STOREY ROOF TO REAR TO
FORM BALCONY, INTERNAL
ALTERATIONS,
REPLACEMENT OF GARAGE
ROOF AND CONSTRUCTION
OF NEW SINGLE STOREY
GARDEN STUDIO SPACE.**

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

Impact on the character and appearance of the Green Belt, character and appearance of the area, and the living conditions of neighbours

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

An L shaped 2 storey stone dwelling, dated from the mid-19th C. The dwelling has apparently been extended, post 1948, with a pavilion conservatory and a flat roof addition at the rear.

There is a large detached flat roof garage adjacent to the dwelling, built in the 1970s.

The dwelling is outside of the Brown Edge Village boundary situated in the Green Belt. The dwelling fronts Broad Lane to the north but has open countryside to the west and south. To the east there is an adjoining neighbour's cottage Amber's Nook.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is to fill the corner alcove, within the L-shape, with a single storey addition that would have a lean to roof and square out the overall footprint of the dwelling – building over the existing conservatory, flat roof addition and well.

A single storey stone gable at the end of the south facing elevation, would be altered to create a flat roof terraced/balcony area by removing the full pitch roof.

A new full pitch roof would be constructed over the existing detached flat roof garage, and a second detached 'studio' outbuilding would be built of similar size.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Local Plan Development Plan Document (Adopted 2020)

S01 Spatial Objectives

SS1 Development Principles
SS10 Other Rural Area Strategy
DC1 Design Considerations
DC3 Landscape Character
T1 Development and Sustainable Transport

National Planning Policy Framework

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

77/04636/OLDDC Erection of garage. Approved.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 20th May 2022
Neighbour consultation period ends: 20th May 2022
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

2 objections have been received, raising the following comments:

- The extension on the boundary would reduce light to the adjoining property
- The introduction of the balcony would overlook the neighbour's gardens, reducing their privacy

Town / Parish Comments

Endon and Brown Edge PC: Awaited

Severn Trent Water

Domestic extension (subject to building over process for 225mm diameter or less)

- May be unmapped transferred public sewers on property
- 225mm or less diameter public sewer(s) shown on our sewer records on property
- Large diameter public sewer(s) (above 225mm diameter) crossing property or in close proximity
- There are no public sewers shown in the immediate area. It is possible that the property is served by a septic tank.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Impact on the Green Belt

Where an 'other rural' area coincides with the Green Belt, the Local Plan strategy SS10 effectively defers to the tests of the national policy set out in the NPPF. While the strategy essentially provides some support in specific circumstances to householder development to meet housing needs, there is nothing in the strategy that overrides the Green Belt policy in the NPPF.

The site is in the Green Belt where development is inappropriate and, by definition, harmful unless it is provided for by one of the exceptions on the closed lists at paragraphs 149 and 150 of the NPPF. One such exception that might be applicable is the extension of a building providing it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.

There is no specific exception for the construction of a garage or studio outbuilding, such structures are either inappropriate development or, if they are close enough to the host dwelling, must be considered as extensions to the original dwelling.

Taking that approach, the dwelling has already been extended, considerably, with the erection of the detached garage in the 1970s, the pavilion conservatory and the flat roof addition.

The garage alone with a footprint of 74 sqm has added around 62% to the footprint of the original dwelling (circa. 120 sq m) and the new detached studio outbuilding would add a further 72 sq m of footprint, more than doubling that of the original dwellinghouse. Obviously, the lean to rear extension (albeit there would be some displacement of the existing additions) and the full pitch roof to be constructed above the existing garage would add yet further addition to original footprint and more mass and volume over and above the size of the original dwelling.

In these regards the proposed development would not be provided for by the exception and it would be inappropriate and harmful development in the Green Belt. Substantial weight should be attributed to such harm and planning permission should only be granted if other considerations clearly outweigh those harms.

The applicant does not present a case, and there is no evidence to demonstrate, that the proposed scheme would be demonstrably better than development that might otherwise be carried out under the provision of the GPDO. As a semi detached dwelling a rear addition, under the terms of the order, could only extend 3m from the rear elevation without some engagement in the 'larger homes' pre notification procedure, which in all likelihood would be hampered by an objection from the neighbour and an assessment of amenity impacts. The order also places a limit on the provision of any additional outbuilding to a scope of reasonableness.

Design and Impact on Character and Appearance

All development shall be well designed and reinforce local distinctiveness by positively contributing to and complementing the special character and heritage of the area in line with the Council's Design Guide SPD.

The SPD guidance says that "Alterations need to be undertaken with care. Insensitive changes can easily spoil a building. The key to a sensitive approach is to take note of what is there already before preparing the design and to work with and not against the building's character (All extensions should harmonise with the parent building). An extension should respect the dominance of the original building and be subordinate to it in terms of its size and massing. Setting back the new section from the building line and keeping the eaves and ridge lower than the parent building will help").

The rear elevation of the dwelling presents as largely the original stone elevation of the mid 19th C cottage, a 1853 stone stamp is visible within the stone work of the elevation. The proposal here would dominate and enclose the rear elevation, at least at ground floor, with an addition that would in-fill and square out the L shaped footprint of the original dwelling with dimensions and proportions that would dictate an unusually pitched shallow lean to roof that would not replicate the roof pitches of the dwelling.

Moreover, a stone single storey gable presenting to the rear, which is part of and contributes to the original character of the elevation, would be altered to the detriment of its character and quality. Its full pitched tile roof would be removed to create a flat roof terrace to a new French door to be punched into the gable behind at first floor level.

The character and shape of the dwelling, observable from the rear, would be concealed and replaced by the proposed addition and alterations. The development would not respect or relate well to the scale, shape, form and character of the original dwelling or those of the neighbours in the locality.

In these regards there would be conflict with the design guide and policies SS10 and DC1 of the Local Plan. Consequently, the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and local distinctiveness when viewed from the rear.

Impacts on the neighbour's living conditions

The development would provide a meaningful and useable area of roof terrace at first floor. During normal use of the terrace, users would be able to easily overlook the neighbour's garden at the adjoining property Ambers Nook and possibly that of the near neighbour, further along to the east at Trimwood. That overlooking would be from significant vantage and within close proximity (10m from side of terrace to garden boundary) and it would be at the expense of the neighbour's reasonable expectations of privacy within their amenity space.

The proposed rear addition would extend from the rear elevation with a side wall built up to the boundary. That side wall would extend 5.5m from rear elevation along the boundary, flanking the neighbour's nearest adjacent principal. The centre of that adjacent window would be much less than 5.5m from the side wall and therefore, the development would obstruct a 45 degree horizontal sight line taken from the centre of the neighbour's window within unreasonably close proximity. The side wall of the development would therefore, reduce a sense of outlook from that window and overshadow and reduce daylight to the window and an important part of the garden area immediately to the rear of the dwelling.

The development would be significantly and unreasonably harmful to the living conditions of the adjacent neighbour, to the extent that there would be conflict with policy DC1 of the Local Plan and the Council's Space About dwellings guidance, in these regards.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

Inappropriate development that would be harmful, by definition, to the Green Belt.

The development is not provided for by any of the exceptions listed at paragraphs 149 and 150 of the NPPF. There are no considerations apparent that would clearly outweigh that harm.

The proposal does not represent good design that would be compliant with the design guide or policy DC1 of the Local Plan. It would create development that is at odds with the original character of the dwelling and that of the neighbours. This would fail to reinforce local distinctiveness and be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

The development's side wall close to the boundary would overshadow and be overbearing when viewed from the neighbour's adjacent principal window. The provision of a roof terrace within close proximity and with vantage over the neighbours garden would cause overlooking and unreasonable detriment to the neighbour's privacy and enjoyment of their property. The development would adversely affect the amenity enjoyed by neighbouring dwellings and there would be conflict with policy DC1 of the Local Plan and Council Space About Dwellings guidance.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : REFUSE

Case Officer: Ben Hurst

Recommendation Date: 25/05/2022

X 

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council