

**Supporting Statement in relation to the
erection of a single storey side extension to
form an annexe**

Little Above Park Farm, Dilhorne

September 2024

Little Above Park Farm

Project	Little Above Park Farm
Client	Mr & Mrs Carnwell
Reference	2363
Project Team	Jon Imber
Version	1.0

Document Produced by:

JMI Planning Limited
62 Carter Street
Uttoxeter
Staffs
ST14 8EU

Phone: 01889 566107
Email: enquiries@jmiplanning.com

www.jmiplanning.com

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Site and Planning History	3
3	The Proposed Development	4
4	Planning Policy Context	5
	National Planning Policy Framework.....	5
	Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan (2020)	6
5	Planning Considerations	7
6	Conclusions	9

1 Introduction

- 1.1 JMI Planning is a Midlands based town planning consultancy. Its directors are chartered town planners with over 30 years' combined experience in both the public and private sector.
- 1.2 The author of this appraisal, Jon Imber, has worked as both a development control and forward planning officer in local government, and more recently as a senior planning consultant in the private sector. He has extensive knowledge of the planning system and experience of the appeals process. He is a member of the Royal Town Planning Institute.

2 Site and Planning History

- 2.1 The application site consists of a two storey detached farmhouse within a rural area approximately 3 kilometres north of the settlement of Dilhorne.
- 2.2 Surrounding uses include the applicant's farmyard to the north, and fields to the south, east and west.
- 2.3 The site sloped gently downwards from north to south. It is set within a wider landscape context of undulating countryside.
- 2.4 The site is accessed via a surfaced driveway which emerges onto Dairyhouse Lane.
- 2.5 The dwelling was constructed in the 1990s. An application seeking the erection of side and rear extensions was refused in October 2022 on the grounds of their scale and design (LPA reference SMD/2021/0295).

2.6 The site lies within the Green Belt.

2.7 The site and surroundings are shown on the following aerial image.



3 The Proposed Development

3.1 It is proposed to erect a single storey side extension on the south elevation of the dwelling.

3.2 The extension will facilitate the formation of an annexe, which is to be occupied by Mr and Mrs Carnwell. The remainder of the house will be continued to be occupied by their son and his family.

- 3.3 In Uttlesford DC v SoS and White [1992], in which a garage attached to a dwelling had been converted to a 'granny annexe', an inspector had determined that where a domestic garage within a residential curtilage was used for living accommodation in connection with the dwelling, no material change of use had occurred. The court agreed, ruling that the fact that the elderly occupier of the annexe had living facilities that enabled her to live independently from the rest of the family did not amount to the creation of a separate planning unit that required permission. The significance of this case is that the even though accommodation in the garage was capable of independent use, the court judgment suggested that a fundamental component of separateness was occupation by someone who was not connected with the family occupation of the whole planning unit.
- 3.4 In this case the annexe would be occupied by family members. The extended family would effectively be living as a single household, sharing garden space and retaining an internal link between the annexe and main dwelling. It is clear from the Uttlesford Judgement that the annexe is therefore ancillary to the main dwelling and does not create a separate planning unit and does not constitute a material change of use.

4 Planning Policy Context

National Planning Policy Framework

- 4.1 Paragraph 2 of the NPPF states that *"applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise"*.
- 4.2 Paragraph 11 of the NPPF establishes a presumption in favour of sustainable development. It explains that in the context of decision taking, this means approving proposals that accord with the development plan without delay.

- 4.3 Paragraph 12 confirms that the presumption in favour of sustainable development established by the Framework does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. Proposed development that conflicts with an up-to-date local plan should not usually be granted planning permission, and decisions that depart from an up-to date development plan should only be taken if material considerations in a particular case indicate that the plan should not be followed.
- 4.4 Paragraph 131 of the Framework relates to design quality. It states *“The creation of high quality beautiful and sustainable 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”*.
- 4.5 Paragraph 152 of the NPPF states that “inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances”. Paragraph 153 makes it clear that “Very special circumstances’ will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations”.
- 4.6 Paragraph 154 states that local planning authorities should view new buildings within the Green Belt as inappropriate development, apart from certain exceptions.

[Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan \(2020\)](#)

- 4.7 Bradley is a rural hamlet which has no formal settlement boundary. Policy SS10 of the Local Plan is therefore applicable. With specific reference to domestic

extensions and alterations, Policy SS10 allows for “extensions or additional domestic outbuildings to existing dwellings provided they are appropriate in scale and design and do not have a detrimental impact on the existing dwelling and the character of the rural area. The Council will assess schemes having regard to the original dwelling, in cases where cumulative change has occurred”.

- 4.8 Policy DC1 of the Local Plan states “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”.

5 Planning Considerations

- 5.1 The proposals involve the extension of an existing rural dwelling to create additional living accommodation.
- 5.2 The application site lies outside of any identified settlement boundary. Policy SS10 allows for a limited range of development in such circumstances, including domestic extensions and outbuildings which are appropriate in scale and design and which do not have a detrimental impact upon the dwelling or its rural surroundings.
- 5.3 The proposed extension is subservient to the existing dwelling in terms of its scale, massing and detailed design. The extension has been consciously designed to respect the character of the existing dwelling. The size and proportion of fenestration is informed by that of the existing dwelling, and materials of construction are to match. The proposed extension complements the traditional style of the host dwelling and would not therefore have a detrimental effect upon the character or appearance of its rural surroundings.

- 5.4 The site lies within Green Belt. Paragraph 152 of the NPPF states that “inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances”. Paragraph 154 makes it clear that new buildings should be viewed as inappropriate development, apart from certain exceptions. One such exception 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.”
- 5.5 The property has not previously been extended. It has a floorspace of approximately 307m². The extension would add approximately 33m², which equates to an increase of just under 11%. The proposals would not therefore result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building, and do not therefore constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
- 5.6 The proposed extension is sufficiently distant from the principal windows of other dwellings to avoid causing an unacceptable reduction in daylight or privacy. The proposals therefore safeguard the amenities enjoyed by the occupants of neighbouring dwellings.
- 5.7 The proposed extension is contained entirely within the existing domestic curtilage and does not encroach into surrounding countryside. Ample space remains within the curtilage to meet the amenity needs of future occupants of the dwelling, as well as to provide adequate parking and turning space.
- 5.8 The proposals therefore accord with Policies SS10 and DC1 of the Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan.

- 5.9 There are no other material planning considerations which act as a barrier to consent being granted in this instance.

6 Conclusions

- 6.1 The proposed extension relates well to the host dwelling. It would not harm the character or appearance of the host dwelling or its rural surroundings.
- 6.2 The proposed extension is modest in scale relative to the original dwelling and does not therefore represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
- 6.3 The proposals would not detrimentally affect the amenities enjoyed by the occupiers of nearby dwellings and would not prejudice the safe or efficient use of the highway network.
- 6.4 The proposals therefore preserve the character and appearance of their rural surroundings in accordance with Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan Policies SS10 and DP1, and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 6.5 It is therefore respectfully requested that the application be approved.