

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2021/0295
Valid 23/04/2021

LITTLE ABOVE PARK FARM
DAIRY HOUSE LANE
DILHORNE

SIDE AND REAR EXTENSIONS
TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL
ROOMS FOR EXTENDED
FAMILY

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Green Belt
- Visual amenity and design
- Amenity
- Highway Safety

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

Little Above Park Farm is a large and modern detached dwelling house in a rural location within the green belt. The dwellinghouse is located on a working farmyard surrounded by pasture land.

The dwelling is constructed of red brick with stone fittings with a plain clay tiles roof.

PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for a side and rear extension, constructed of materials to match the existing dwelling. On the first floor the proposed extension will provide 2 extra bedroom, making 6 in total. On the ground floor the extension will provide a playroom, dayroom, and rear porch with WC. A patio area outside of the rear porch is also proposed.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Local Plan (adopted 9th September 2020)

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

National Planning Policy Framework

Adopted Supplementary Planning Documents/Guidance (SPD/G):

- Design Principles SPG
- Design Guide SPD adopted 21st February 2018

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

SMD/1995/0787 – Approval of reserved matters in respect of the replacement farmhouse following approval REF:SM93-0942 APPROVED 14/03/1995

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 08/06/2021
Neighbour consultation period ends: N/A
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

No Comments Received

Town / Parish Comments

Cheadle Town Council – It was resolved that Council had no objection to this Application

Seven Trent Water

As the proposal has minimal impact on the public sewerage system I can advise we have no objections to the proposals and do not require a drainage condition to be applied.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The site is instead considered to be countryside under LP Policy SS 10, which states that these areas will provide only for development which has an essential need to be located in the countryside, supports the rural diversification and sustainability of the rural areas, promotes sustainable tourism and enhances the countryside.

NPPF Paragraph 149 (c) states that if the extension or alteration of a building provided does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building then it is considered appropriate development within the green belt.

The proposed extensions would result in a volume increase of 33.7%. As such in terms of volume increase the development would not result in a disproportionate addition. Therefore, the principle of the extension is acceptable subject to an assessment of its design and impact on visual amenity

Design and impact on visual amenity.

LP Policy DC 1 states that 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.

SMDC Design Guide (SPD) paragraph 5.5 states that all extensions should harmonise with the parent building. An extensions should respect the dominance of the original building and be subordinate to, in terms of 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.

Paragraph 126 of the NPPF states the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.

The application property is located within the open countryside on a working farm. The site is visible On approach from Dairy House Lane. FP 21 travels up Dairy House Lane and then splits into FP21 and FP20. FP20 goes past the application property and through the farm yard. When viewed from the road and these footpaths the property is visible from all angles. The southern and rear elevations are the most prominent elevations when viewed from the road.

The existing property is large in size and has a two-storey outrigger that has the appearance of a two storey side extension as it is set back from the front elevation and set down from the ridge. This outrigger was constructed at the same time as the replacement dwelling. The proposed extension would result in this outrigger and the proposed two storey side extension having the appearance of an extension. When combined the extension and outrigger measures more than half the width of the main dwelling. Despite being set back and set down from the ridge the development results in the property having the appearance of a terrace row as the extension would dominate the side extension due to the significant sideward projection.

In terms of the proposed rearward projection of the two-storey rear extension it is not considered that the development would result in a dominant addition on its own. However, when combined with the two-storey side extension the proposed extensions would dominate the existing dwelling as the development would overwhelm the southern part of the dwelling.

Reference is made to the fallback position of the erection of a two storey rear and single storey side extension. In the case of *Gambone v SSCLG and Wolverhampton City Council* [2014] EWHC 952, the Court considered the relevant authorities that deal with the fall back position. The Court concluded that consideration of the fall back position involves a two stage approach (paragraph 25 – 26):

- (i) Is the way in which the land may be developed a matter that amounts to a material consideration? It will be a material consideration where there is a greater than theoretical possibility that development might take place, for example, where there is a planning permission in place.

- (ii) Once the question of whether the fall back is a material consideration has been concluded, the question that then arises for the decision maker is what weight that should be attached to the fall back. The weight that might be attached to it will vary from case to case and will be fact sensitive. Issues that the decision maker will wish to bear in mind include the scale of harm that would arise if the fall back were implemented. The likelihood of the fall back occurring is also relevant to the weight to be attributed to the fall back position.

In this case, there is no evidence that there is reasonable likelihood that the applicant would implement these permitted development rights. In any event, the fall back position would be considerably different and the degree of harm arising from a single storey side extension would be less than the proposed development which involves 2 storey development to the side.

Amenity

Section 12 Paragraph 130(f) of the NPPF states that development should create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Due to the rural location of the dwellinghouse, there are no neighbouring residences which the proposed extension would impact.

Highway Safety

LP Parking Guidance states that Class C3 (residential Dwellings) should have a number of car parking spaces sufficient for the type of residence. Up to three bedrooms, requires two spaces for residents and visitors within the curtilage of the dwelling. Four or more bedrooms requires three spaces.

Due to the location of the dwelling there are no major roads which the proposal would impact. There is also ample hardstanding within the farmyard which can provide off-street parking.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

It is considered that because of its scale and massing, the development would result in an extension that would dominate the application property and would be seen as a bulky and incongruous addition. Therefore, the requirements for the design of the extension to harmonise with the existing building is not met. It is for the above reasons and having regard to all material considerations and matters raised that I recommend accordingly.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : That the application be refused

Case Officer: Rebecca Bowers

Recommendation Date: 18.10.2022

X *B.J. Haywood*

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council