

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2023/0142
Valid 21/03/2023

STEINFIELDS FARM
BROAD LANE
BROWN EDGE

NEW REAR EXTENSION TO
REPLACE EXISTING,
INTERNAL ALTERATIONS &
NEW PORCH

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Impact on the Green Belt, character and appearance of the area, and the living conditions of neighbouring dwellings

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 flat roof and square out the overall footprint of the dwelling –building over the existing conservatory, existing flat roof addition and old well.

An alteration to provide first floor balcony; an addition to the roof of the detached garage; and the provision of a detached outbuilding, present on a previous submission, have all been omitted from the proposed scheme.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Local Plan Development Plan Document (Adopted 2020)

S01 Spatial Objectives
SS1 Development Principles
SS10 Other Rural Area
DC1 Design Considerations
DC3 Landscape Characteristics
T1 Development and Sustainable Transport

National Planning Policy Framework

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

SMD/2022/0109 Extensions to dwelling and garage and new studio building.

REFUSED

HNT/2023/003 Rear extension. Prior Approval Granted.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 20/04/2023

Neighbour consultation period ends: 20/04/2023

Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

None

The adjoining neighbour had objected to the previous planning application SMD/2022/0109 on the grounds that the flanking wall would block daylight. They appear however to have had a change of heart and were keen to respond to a recent 'larger homes' PD consultation HNT/2023/004 confirming that they had no objection.

There has been no comment or objection to this application.

Town / Parish Comments

Brown Edge Parish Council: Awaited

OFFICER COMMENTS

Impact on 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.

The dwelling has already been extended, considerably, with the erection of the detached garage in the 1970s (within proximity close enough to be considered part of the dwelling), 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). The proposed rear extension (albeit there would be some displacement of the existing additions) would add yet further addition to original footprint and more mass and volume over and above the size of the original dwelling. However, with the omission of the garage enlargement and the provision of

the studio outbuilding, this proposal would add considerably less enlargement than that of the previous application.

Nevertheless, the proposed development, would in these regards 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.

Since the previous scheme was refused, this authority has accepted that a flat roof addition, that would extend from the original rear elevation by 4m would be permitted development and has granted prior approval following the notification procedure. Importantly, there was a determination that the proposed addition, which would have a width more than half that of the original dwelling, would not 'extend beyond a wall forming a side elevation of the original dwelling' because the proposal included a narrow gap between the proposed addition and the side of the existing rear addition and gabled outrigger.

In these circumstances the applicant could proceed with the permitted 'larger homes' extension that would include the narrow gap between the side of the proposal and that of the existing outrigger. Such an addition would appear contrived and awkward, but in the absence of any other permission, the applicant would have no alternative and it is likely that the development would be carried out. On balance therefore it would be better that the authority grants a planning permission for the development proposed with this application, while the authority would be granting planning permission for inappropriate development, it would have more cohesive design and run through across the rear elevation without the awkward gap.

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.

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

In these regards there would be conflict with the design guide and policies SS10 and

DC1 of the Local Plan. However, on balance the proposed development would be better in design terms than the permitted 'larger homes' scheme because it would omit the contrived or awkward narrow gap between the sides of the new development and that of the existing outrigger.

Impacts on the neighbour's living conditions

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 window. 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 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.

However, the neighbour has not objected to the application and this development would have no greater impact on the neighbour's amenity than the permitted 'larger homes' extension which would be of similar size. The neighbour has already confirmed that they have no objection to the permitted scheme.

While the authority should not grant planning permission for harmful development, on balance, the better design option of the application proposal tips in favour of the application development that would be no more harmful to the amenity of the neighbour.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The development would be inappropriate and, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt; it would be less than sympathetic to the character and appearance of the original dwelling; and there would be some harm to the amenity of the adjacent neighbour. However, on balance the development proposed with this application would, in design terms, be better than a permitted 'larger homes' scheme which the applicant would be free to build as an alternative.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : APPROVE

Case Officer: Ben Hurst

Recommendation Date: 16th May 2023

X 

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council