Planning Reference No:	09/2053N
Application Address:	Lane End Cottage, Marsh Lane, Edleston,
	Nantwich, CW5 8PA
Proposal:	Replacement Bedroom over existing Utility Room
	to Enable Creation of Home Office Space and
	Shower Area
Applicant:	Mr K Burton
Application Type:	Householder
Grid Reference:	362751 350941
Ward:	Cholmondeley
Earliest Determination Date:	17 <sup>th</sup> August 2009
Expiry Dated:	30 <sup>th</sup> August 2009
Date of Officer's Site Visit:	13 <sup>th</sup> August 2009
Date Report Prepared:	13 <sup>th</sup> August 2009
Constraints:	Open Countryside

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

**MAIN ISSUES** 

The main issues are the effect (of the proposal) on the

Character and appearance of the building/area Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

# 1. REASON FOR REFERRAL

The application was to be dealt with under the scheme of delegation. However Cllr Bailey has called in the application in order to give due consideration to the reduced scale of the proposal following an earlier appeal (P08/0718) and in light of LP Policy RES.11 and The Householder Extensions SPD.

## 2. DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND CONTEXT

The application site consists of a dwelling located within the Open Countryside, which has been extended considerably over time. The site has had a use change from paddock land to residential use. The building has a traditional red brick finish, and the application sites boundaries comprise hedging around the edges of the garden areas, as well as a red brick wall along the east boundary. The neighbouring properties are located over 20m away and separated by a large open field to the West and hedging to the North.

# 3. DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

The proposal is for a first floor extension on the eastern side of the building, over an existing ground floor extension. The extension will be 4.3m in depth and 5.7m in width and will increase the total height of the side extension from 3.7m to 5.7m which will be 0.8m lower than the height of the main body of the house. The proposal includes two different eaves level heights, 3.5m on the north-west elevation which is 0.8m lower than that on the host dwelling, and 4.2m on the south-east elevation. The proposal includes the introduction of a dormer window to the north-west elevation. The scheme does not increase the footprint of the present dwelling.

# 4. RELEVANT HISTORY

P08/0718 – Application for First Floor extension. Refused 5<sup>th</sup> August 2008 and subsequently dismissed at appeal 4<sup>th</sup> February 2009 P08/0270 – Application for a First Floor extension. Refused 28<sup>th</sup> April 2008 P00/0872- Ground Floor Extension & change of use from paddock land to residential use. Approved 9<sup>th</sup> November 2000 P98/0363- Two Storey Extension. Approved 29<sup>th</sup> June 1998 P95/0412- First Floor Extension. Approved 27<sup>th</sup> June 1995 7/07811- Lounge Extension. Approved 19<sup>th</sup> March 1981 R.5418 – Alteration and Extension. Approved 30<sup>th</sup> July 1973

# 5. POLICIES

Local Plan Policy (Borough of Crewe and Nantwich Replacement Local Plan 2011)

NE.2 (Open Countryside) BE.1 (Amenity) BE.2 (Design Standards) BE.3 (Access and Parking) RES.11 (Improvements and Alterations to Existing Dwellings)

## **Other Material Considerations**

LDF Extensions and Householder Development SPD (2008) PPS1 – Delivering Sustainable Development

## 6. CONSULTATIONS (External to Planning)

None

# 7. VIEWS OF THE PARISH / TOWN COUNCIL

None received at time of writing

### 8. OTHER REPRESENTATIONS

One letter of support from The Poplars dated 31<sup>st</sup> July 2009 stating that they have no objection to the proposal which will have no adverse impact on their views, and will not overlook their house in any way.

### 9. APPLICANT'S SUPPORTING INFORMATION

None

#### **10. OFFICER APPRAISAL**

### **Principle of Development**

The application dwelling is located within the Open Countryside. Policy RES.11 states that within areas of Open Countryside the original dwelling must remain the dominant element with the extension remaining subordinate to it. The justification of the policy states that the extension should not result in the creation of a dwelling that is double or more than double the size of the original dwelling, this is reiterated in paragraph 3.31 of the Extensions and Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document.

The Inspector that dismissed the previous planning appeal commented that it was not conclusive what constituted the original dwelling for the purpose of Policy RES.11. Notwithstanding this it is clearly evident from the scale of the property and the recorded planning history that this property has been extended above and beyond the threshold stated within the Local Plan justification for Policy RES.11, to the detriment of the original dwelling. Any further extensions to this property regardless of their scale, design or position would have an adverse impact on the dwelling and would be contrary to policy. Although this application appears to be only minor in the volume it proposes, consideration has to be given to the cumulative impact that this piecemeal form of development would have with previous extensions and alterations.

In his consideration of the previously dismissed appeal (P08/0718) the Inspector highlights that the SPD states that the form and location of an extension in the open countryside should be carefully considered and must not dominate the appearance of the dwelling. The Inspector goes on to state that *"The proposed development would be in a prominent position on the building and would be seen from the highway and open countryside around it. The extension would be set against a gable with double pitched roof. These pitched roof elements and that of the single storey annexe below them, currently provide balance in the built form at the north eastern end of the building". The implication in this statement is that any first floor extension in this location would unbalance the building and would be unacceptable. Although the current proposal is smaller than the previous scheme, it is located in the same position and is therefore inappropriate. It would have the same impact on the character and appearance of the property as the scheme considered at Appeal which the Inspector stated <i>"would be a dominant feature in views of the house and any part of the north western elevation that constitutes the original building"* and concluded that the

*"proposed development would be unacceptably harmful to the character and appearance of Lane End Cottage and conflicts with LP policy RES.11 and the SPD".* The reduction in the size and scale of the proposed development would be immaterial.

### Design

The first floor extension is sited above an existing ground floor extension to the side of the dwelling. The existing side floor extension is sited forward of the building line of the remainder of the property and is clearly identified as a subservient element to the dwelling, this elevation retains a coherence and simplicity. Although the proposed extension has a lower ridge height than the host dwelling its forward siting will draw undue attention to itself and will visually compete with the original dwelling.

The existing north-east elevation is characterised by two two-storey gables with the single storey extension below these. The proposed extension will result in a third gable being visible from this aspect which will result in a lower ridge height and contrasting eaves heights. The series of eaves level heights and unbalanced gables provide a confused composition when viewed from the north-east elevation to the detriment of the character and appearance of the dwelling.

### Amenity

The proposal consists of a first floor extension on the east side of the property. There is a window proposed to the east elevation, which look out onto the open field. The separation between the application site and surrounding properties is over 20m. The boundaries are hedging with a redbrick wall along the West boundary. Therefore there is no adverse impact on amenity.

#### 11. CONCLUSIONS

It is considered that the proposed development will have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the open countryside. A previous planning application which was dismissed at appeal proposed a first floor extension in the position of this further planning application. The Inspector considered that an extension in this position would cause demonstrable harm to the original dwelling and open countryside.

#### 12. RECOMMENDATIONS

#### REFUSE

1. The position, scale and design of the proposed extension, when taken cumulatively with the existing alterations and extensions, will over dominate the original dwelling to the detriment of its character and appearance and also the openness of the countryside, contrary to policy RES.11 (Improvements and Alterations to Existing Dwellings) from the Borough of Crewe and Nantwich Replacement Local Plan 2011.





09/2053N – Lane End Cottage Marsh Lane Edleston N.G.R; - 362.750 350.921 Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey Map with the permission of HMSO.

onino Edot o odnon noonoo no. 1000 100 10.

© Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to legal or civil proceedings. Cheshire East Council licence no. 100049045. Not to Scale

-----