

## DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

---

**SMD/2022/0434**  
**Valid 02/08/2022**

**ROUGHSTONES CHEADLE  
ROAD  
DRAYCOTT IN THE MOORS**

**PROPOSED EXTENSIONS  
AND ALTERATIONS  
(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)**

---

### MAIN ISSUES

Impact on the Green Belt and the character and appearance of the area

### DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site is located within the North Staffordshire Green Belt and comprises a modest detached red brick two storey dwelling built in the later 1970s/early 1980s. The dwelling is on a raised plot surrounded by private lanes that provide access to a loose scattered grouping of neighbouring properties. The dwelling is surrounded by groupings of woodland and mature hedgerow.

### PROPOSAL

The proposal would enlarge the dwelling by adding a first floor to the existing flat roof garage. The addition would have a full pitched roof. Alterations would add a gable feature and a full height first floor glazing feature.

### 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  
T1 Development and Sustainable Transport

SMDC Design Guide

#### National Planning Policy Framework

### SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

77/04712/OLDDC Erection of dwelling. Approved.  
89/00818/OLD Extension to form double garage. Approved.

### CONSULTATIONS

#### Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 6/09/2022  
Neighbour consultation period ends: 6/09/2022  
Press Advert: N/A

**Public Comments**

None

**Town / Parish Comments**

Draycott in the Moors PC: Awaited

**Staffordshire County Council Highways**

No Objection. Parking standard compliant.

**Severn Trent**

Records do not show public sewers on site

**OFFICER COMMENTS****Principle of Development**

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 to the Green Belt, unless it is provided for by one of the exceptions that appear on the closed list at paras. 149 and 150 of the NPPF.

One of those exceptions is the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the 'original building'. Original building means, for the purposes of the NPPF, a building as it existed on 1<sup>st</sup> July 1948, or if built after 1948, as it was originally built.

The original dwelling was built in the early 1970s as a modest red brick detached dwelling. It was extended in 1989 with a flat roof garage to the side elevation. The garage almost doubled the size of the original dwelling's footprint (circa 80% increase). The proposal is to compound that size increase by adding a first floor element above the garage to make that doubling effect apparent in terms of both footprint and volume. The proposal would result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building and the development would be inappropriate and harmful to the Green Belt.

Any harm to the Green Belt must be attributed substantial weight and planning permission should only be granted if other considerations clearly outweigh that harm.

**Design and Impact on Character and Appearance**

Policy DC1 of the Local Plan requires all development to 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 side elevation of the dwelling is elevated and prominent when viewed from the lane to the front or south west. It makes a strong and relatively imposing contribution to local distinctiveness and the character and appearance of the area.

The form and shape of the original dwelling is distinctly identifiable as a modest red brick dwelling, the large flat roof garage addition runs off with a simple and subordinate shape, form and character. There is a clear distinction between the garage element and the arrangement of the original dwelling.

The proposal however, would make additions that would introduce shape and architectural detailing that would not be respectful of the dwelling's simple form and character. The side addition and the architectural alterations would be in a very exposed, prominent and elevated location above the private lanes to the south west.

The proposals do not represent good design that would be respectful of the subordinate, simple form and character of the dwelling.

The proposals would fail to reinforce local distinctiveness and be harmful to the character and appearance of the area when viewed from the rear. In these respects the development would be contrary to policies SS10 and DC1 of the SMDC Local Plan 2020 and the Design Guide 2018 for the area.

### **Amenity**

No issues of harm are raised in respect of the developments impact on the living conditions or amenity of neighbours.

### **Highway Safety**

The property would remain parking standard compliant.

### **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.

**OFFICER RECOMMENDATION :  
REFUSE**

**Case Officer: Ben Hurst**

**Recommendation Date: 27/09/2022**

X 

---

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

**On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council**