

Application No: **10/4984N**

Location: **The Cottage, Edleston Hall Lane, Ravensmoor, CW5 8PJ**

Proposal: **Proposed Residential Extension & Alteration Works to Existing House**

Applicant: **Mr & Mrs N Hammersley**

Expiry Date: **17-Feb-2011**

Ward **Cholmondeley**

**SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION:**  
**Refuse**

**MAIN ISSUES:**

- **Principle of development**
- **Impact of the development on the open countryside**
- **Impact of the development on the host dwelling**
- **Impact of the development on residential amenity**

**REASON FOR REFERRAL**

This application has been called in to Southern Planning Committee by Cllr Bailey for the following reasons:

*“Concerns relating to the inconsistency in the interpretation of policy relating to extensions in the open countryside given other development within the area.”*

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND CONTEXT**

The application site lies within the open countryside located on the south side of Edleston Hall Lane. Edleston Hall Lane is an unclassified road with a scattered pattern of development along it.

The Cottage is a two storey brick dwelling built on two levels with the higher level a later addition to the traditional cottage.

**DETAILS OF PROPOSAL**

The application seeks permission for a two storey rear extension 13 metres wide projecting 3 metres at first floor and 4 metres at ground floor level. A single storey extension would be provided to the rear of the existing single storey lean-to at the side of the dwelling projecting 4 metres to the rear. The proposal also includes the remodelling of the existing bay window on the front elevation serving the existing dining room and the rendering of part of the existing dwelling.

## **RELEVANT HISTORY**

**4/5/9504** – Proposed Alterations and Extensions to Existing Cottage and New Garage. Planning permission was approved 27<sup>th</sup> March 1973.

**09/2563N** – Two Storey Rear Extension. Planning permission was refused 8<sup>th</sup> October 2009.

**10/0703N** – Certificate of Lawful Proposed Development for Two Storey Rear Extension to Existing Dwelling. A negative certificate was issued 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2010.

## **POLICIES**

### **Local Plan Policy**

NE.2 (Open Countryside)

BE.1 (Amenity)

BE.2 (Design Standards)

RES.11 (Improvements and Alterations to Existing Dwellings)

### **Supplementary Planning Documents**

Borough of Crewe and Nantwich SPD: Extensions and Householder Development

### **Other Material Considerations**

PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development

### **CONSULTATIONS (External to Planning)**

No external Consultees

### **VIEWS OF THE PARISH COUNCIL:**

If a consultation response is received this will be provided by update

### **OTHER REPRESENTATIONS:**

None received at the time of writing the report. If any are received they will be provided by update.

## **OFFICER APPRAISAL**

### **Principle of Development**

The application site is situated in the open countryside. Policy RES.11 states that in the open countryside the original dwelling must remain as the dominant element with the extension subordinate to it. The justification for policy RES.11 expands on this stating that extensions must not result in the creation of a dwelling that is double or more than double the size of the original dwelling. The original dwelling is defined as that which existed on 1<sup>st</sup> July 1948 or the dwelling as originally built, whichever is most recent.

The Cottage was originally a small dwelling which was extended under permission granted in 1973. This extension approximately doubled the size of the original dwelling and can clearly

be seen by the two mismatching bricks and due to the extension being built at a higher level. The extension now being proposed under this application would increase the floorspace by approximately 82% over the existing dwelling today which would mean an increase of 263% over the original dwelling. Whilst this indicates a large increase the case officer for the 1973 application observed that in allowing that extension the resulting dwelling would only provide a basic level of accommodation by the standards of the day which was some 38 years ago. It is noted that this dwelling is still relatively small and there have been a number of large extensions and replacement dwellings allowed within the locality. The neighbouring property Maydean, for example, has been extended to more than double the size of the original dwelling and was allowed a further extension in 2009 and a large detached double garage in 2007. Given that this is the case, some increase above the 100% would not be completely objectionable and moreover the original dwelling has lost some of its identity by virtue of the fact the existing extension is not subordinate and the front entrance is provided on that extension. However policy RES.11 clearly states that the original dwelling must remain as the dominant element and the extension subordinate to it and whilst this extension will bring the dwelling to a standard more akin to other properties within the locality the calculation of percentage increase is not the only consideration in determining whether an extension is subordinate.

The extension spans the entire two storey rear elevation and although set in 200mm each side, this has little effect in reducing the impact of the extension on the host building. The Supplementary Planning Document, Extensions and Householder Development, states that rear extensions should be designed not to dominate the whole of the rear elevation. This extension will overwhelm the existing dwelling and does not respect its setting, scale or form. Additionally the increased bulk and mass is a significant addition to the built form in the open countryside which would fail to be subordinate and would lead to a loss of identity of the original dwelling. There has been a reduction in size from the previous refused planning application by reducing the rear projection at first floor level from 4 metres to 3 metres and from 5 metres to 4 metres at ground floor. The external canopy has also been removed from the ground floor level. These changes have reduced the overall bulk and mass however on balance, it is considered the changes do not overcome the concerns relating to the span of the extension and the overall scale and bulk of built development proposed.

## **Design**

The proposed extension would be Oak framed with render infill panels and clay roof tiles. The application also proposes to render the existing extension. This would represent an improvement over the current situation where various facing bricks have been used which is to the detriment of the character and appearance of the dwelling. This approach will ensure that there are only two distinct finishes and avoid a mismatch by adding a further brick to the dwelling. The Oak framing is not a feature which is evident on the original dwelling however this is not wholly objectionable because it allows the extensions to be clearly distinguished from the original dwelling and is considered a sympathetic solution to the poorly matched brickwork of the existing dwelling.

The proposed rear elevation introduces substantial glazing, mainly at ground floor level but also a large two storey feature wall in the middle section which will be recessed at ground floor level. The remaining windows at first floor would be more traditional and in keeping with the existing windows. The reason for refusal on the previous application stated that the fenestration failed to respect the traditional design and appearance of the host building. The alterations made to the fenestration in this scheme go some way to address those concerns, particularly at first floor level, however the overall character and appearance is still very dominated by the glazed walls which are not in keeping with the traditional appearance of the

existing building. However, the design and appearance of the extension as a whole is more in keeping with the host dwelling.

The proposal also includes the remodelling of the bay window to the front elevation. This would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the dwelling and would be of a design more in keeping with other dwellings in the area and sympathetic to the surroundings.

### **Amenity**

The extension will be approximately 50 metres from the nearest neighbouring dwelling, Maydean which is located to the east. It is therefore considered that this proposal will not result in significant harm to neighbouring amenity in terms of loss of light, visual intrusion or overlooking.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

On balance, the proposal does not overcome the reasons for refusal on the previous scheme. Due to its size, scale, bulk and massing and its position and proportions spanning the entire rear elevation, it would not be subordinate and would overwhelm the original dwelling. The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

**REFUSE** for the following reasons:-

**1. The proposed extension by virtue of its size, scale, position and proportions, spanning the entire rear elevation of the existing dwelling, would not be subordinate and would overwhelm the original dwelling contrary to Policies NE.2 (Open Countryside), BE.2 (Design Standards) and RES.11 (Improvements and Alterations to Existing Dwellings) of the Borough of Crewe and Nantwich Replacement Local plan 2011 and guidance contained within the Local Development Framework Extensions and Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document 2008.**

