

Application No: 13/2051C

Location: RUE MOSS COTTAGE, BACK LANE, SMALLWOOD, SANDBACH, CHESHIRE, CW11 2UN

Proposal: First floor extension (Resubmission of 13/0766C)

Applicant: Mr R Stockwell

Expiry Date: 11-Jul-2013

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION:

REFUSE

Main issues:

- The principle of development
- The impact upon the character and appearance of the application property
- The impact upon neighbouring residential amenity
- The impact upon protected species

REASON FOR REFERRAL

This application was called in to Southern Planning Committee by Councillor John Wray for the following reasons;

- *'The extension proposal is not disproportionate to the size of existing dwelling.'*
- *'Other similar extensions in the area much larger than this have been approved. The footprint of the property is not increased by this proposal.'*
- *'There is no objection from the Parish Council or neighbours, who actually support this modest extension.'*
- *'The extension is essential to accommodate the needs of a growing family to provide separate bedroom accommodation for the children.'*

DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND CONTEXT

The application site comprises a detached, two-storey dwelling located on land north of Back Lane, Smallwood within the Open Countryside and Jodrell Bank Radio Telescope Consultation Zone.

The property has an open brick finish, white uPVC fenestration and a dual-pitched pain grey tiled roof.

DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

Revised plans have been submitted for a first floor domestic extension.

The proposed extension would measure approximately 3 metres in depth, 7 metres in width and would have a dual-pitched roof approximately 2.8 metres in height and 5.6 metres in height from ground floor level.

The original submission consisted of a hipped roof.

This proposal is a re-submission of withdrawn application 13/0766C which was to be recommended for refusal by reason of its size when considered cumulatively with previous additions to the property, would lead to a loss of identity of the original dwelling and be tantamount to a new dwelling in the Open Countryside. As such, the proposed development would have been contrary to the Policies; PS8 (Open Countryside), GR2 (Design) and H16 (Extensions to Dwellings in the Green Belt and Green Belt) of the Congleton Borough Local Plan First Review 2005. It was also considered that the proposal would have been contrary to the NPPF.

RELEVANT HISTORY

13/0766C - First Floor Extension – Withdrawn 15th April 2013

05/0094/FUL - Proposed two storey extension comprising sitting room and bedroom – Approved 7th April 2005

34494/3 - Proposed stables – Approved 5th July 2002

30643/3 - Detached double garage & porch for domestic use – Approved 26th February 1999

28571/3 - Change of use of existing rural building and agricultural land to single dwelling with domestic garden – Approved 26th November 1996

25983/5 - Application for certificate of lawfulness in respect of the proposed use of rue moss cottage as a dwelling – Negative certificate 9th March 1994

24118/1 - To provide retirement cottage/bungalow – Withdrawn 20th March 1992

POLICIES

National policy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Local Plan policy

PS8 – Open Countryside

GR1 – New development
GR2 – Design
GR6 – Amenity and Health
H16 – Extensions to Dwellings in the Open Countryside and Green Belt
NR2 – Wildlife and Nature Conservation – Statutory Sites

CONSULTATIONS (External to Planning)

University of Manchester (Jodrell Bank) – No objections

Public Rights of Way (PROW) – No objections, but would like to remind the applicant of their responsibilities

VIEWS OF THE PARISH COUNCIL:

Smallwood Parish Council – No comments received at time of report

OTHER REPRESENTATIONS:

No comments received at time of report

APPLICANT'S SUPPORTING INFORMATION:

Design and Access Statement

OFFICER APPRAISAL

Principle of Development

The applicant's property is located within the Open Countryside as determined by the Congleton Borough Local Plan First Review 2005. As such, the determination of the application is dependent on its compliance with Policy PS8 (Open Countryside) and general policies; H16 (Extensions to Dwellings in the Open Countryside and Green Belt), GR1 (New Development), GR2 (Design), GR6 (Amenity and Health) and NR2 (Wildlife and Nature Conservation – Statutory Sites) of the Local Plan.

Paragraph 17 of the NPPF details the core principles of sustainable development. It is stated, inter alia that planning should recognize *'the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.'* It is also a principle that planning should *'always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.'* As such, the NPPF supports the Local Plan policies that apply in this instance.

Policy H16 of the Local Plan advises that within the Open Countryside the original dwelling must remain as the dominant element with the extension subordinate it. To help ascertain this dominance, the policy subtext advises that *'A large extension may, if approved, lead to a loss of identity of the original dwelling and could be tantamount to the erection of a new dwelling in the countryside which would not normally be*

permitted. In the context of this policy a 'modest' extension would normally comprise in the region of a 30% increase in the volume.'

Within the Officer's report relating to the last extension at this property in 1996 (Application number 05/0094/FUL), it was advised that '*...The proposal will involve an increase in volume of approximately 30%...*'

When taking the previous additions and demolitions into consideration, combined with the current proposal, the development would represent an approximate 50% increase in the volume of the original property.

As such, it is considered that the proposed development, when considered in conjunction to previous extensions, would lead to a loss of identity of the original dwelling and could be deemed to be tantamount to the erection of a new dwelling in the countryside. As such, it is considered that the proposed extension is contrary to Policy H16 and subsequently Policy PS8 of the Local Plan and would be unacceptable in principle.

Design Standards

Notwithstanding the above, the proposed extension would not appear subordinate to the existing dwelling as its ridge height would mirror the height of the existing roof. It is normal practice to opt for a lower ridge height in order to create a subordinate appearance.

It would be constructed from materials and finishes that would match the main dwelling (exposed brick, a grey concrete tiled, dual-pitched roof and white uPVC fenestration) and it is acknowledged that it would not be readily visible from the streetscene as the dwelling is situated well away from the closest road. However, this would not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the Open Countryside and the loss of the identity of the original dwelling.

Also, in particular, Paragraph 64 states that, '*Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.*'

In this instance, it is considered that the cumulative increase in size of this dwelling would have a detrimental impact upon the character and quality of this rural area and as such, it is deemed to be contrary to the design aspect of the NPPF.

Amenity

The closest neighbouring unit to the development site is Rue Moss Hall which would be located over 50 metres away from the proposed development.

As a result of this separation distance, it is not considered that the proposed development would create any neighbouring amenity issues and would adhere with Policy GR6 of the Local Plan.

Nature Conservation

The Council's Nature Conservation Officer has advised that he considers that there would be no protected species concerns with the proposal. As such, it is considered that the proposed development would adhere with Policy NR2 of the Local Plan.

Other Matters

The land edged red on this site location plan includes land which is considered to be outside of the lawful domestic curtilage of the property. This application is a householder proposal, which does not seek consent for or infer any change of use of land to domestic curtilage and it is recommended that an informative to this effect is added to the decision notice.

CONCLUSIONS

The property is located within the Open Countryside where extensions to dwellings are permitted provided that they are modest and do not result in a loss of the character and identity of the original dwelling.

Modest extensions are defined as being in the region of a 30% increase in the volume of the original dwelling. This proposal, when taken cumulatively with previous additions would result in a 50% increase and a loss of the identity of the original dwelling contrary to Local Plan Policy H16.

Furthermore, the design of the proposal is such that it would not appear subordinate which would exacerbate this problem and would detract from the character and appearance of both the property itself and the surrounding Open Countryside, contrary to Policy GR2 of the Local Plan.

Whilst the dwelling is well screened from the public road, and the proposal is acceptable in terms of its impact upon amenity and protected species, this does not outweigh the concerns outlined above and accordingly it is recommended for refusal.

RECOMMENDATIONS

REFUSE for the following reasons;

1. The proposed extension by reason of its size when considered cumulatively with previous additions to the property, would lead to a loss of identity of the original dwelling and be tantamount to a new dwelling in the Open Countryside. As such, the proposed development would be contrary to the Policies; PS8 (Open Countryside), GR2 (Design) and H16 (Extensions to Dwellings in the Green Belt and Green Belt) of the Congleton Borough Local Plan First Review 2005. It is also considered that the proposal would be contrary to advice within the NPPF.

(c) Crown copyright and database rights 2013. Ordnance Survey
100049045, 100049046.

