

**9. FULL APPLICATION – DEMOLITION OF EXISTING SINGLE STOREY BOOT ROOM AND REPLACEMENT WITH SINGLE STOREY OAK FRAMED ORANGERY/BOOT ROOM (NP/SM/0719/0805) TM**

**APPLICANT: MR AND MRS McCANCE**

**Summary**

1. The proposed single storey oak orangery/boot does not harmonise with the host dwelling room in terms of size, scale, massing and design and would harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and its setting. The application is recommended for refusal.

**Site and Surroundings**

2. Nields Farm is located in an isolated site in open countryside. Nields Farm is a traditional two storey farmhouse constructed in gritstone with a roof of Staffordshire blue plain clay tiles. All windows and doors are timber, the windows are painted white and the doors brown. The property has a T-shaped form.
3. There is a public footpath that runs along the track directly through the farm yard 20m south of the proposed site. The nearest neighbouring property is Cliff Farm which is located 260m to the south.

**Proposal**

4. This application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of an existing single storey boot room on the east elevation and the construction of a replacement single storey oak framed orangery/boot room to provide additional living accommodation.
5. The proposed single storey side extension would protrude 4.37m from the eastern elevation of the host dwelling and would be 6.79m in width. The boot room would be attached to south side of the proposed orangery and would protrude 3.36m by 1.5m width.
6. The orangery would be constructed from a combination of oak frames and coursed stone. All new windows and doors would be constructed from oak. The roof would be partially tiled with reclaimed Staffordshire blue tile and would include a large glazed lantern.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:**

**The proposed single storey oak framed orangery by virtue of the size, scale, form, massing and design, fails to harmonise with or adequately respect the character and appearance of the existing dwelling. The proposal would also have an unduly harmful visual impact on the character of this part of the National Park. In addition, the proposal fails to properly address sustainability and climate change mitigation. As such, the proposed development is contrary to guidance and to the requirements of Core Strategy policies GSP1, GSP3 and L3, CC1 and Development Management Policies DMC3 and DMH7.**

**Key Issues**

- The principle of development

- The impact on the appearance of the property

### **History**

7. NP/SM/0808/0742: Replacement building including equestrian and domestic uses and change of use of the land to a mixed use of equestrian and domestic. Granted conditionally. November 2008.
8. NP/SM/1205/1211: Extension to dwelling. Granted conditionally March 2006.
9. SM1098129: Formation of schooling area for horses. Granted conditionally December 1998.

### **Consultations**

10. Leekfrith Parish Council: *“Members of Leekfrith Parish Council fully support this Planning Proposal”*
11. Staffordshire Moorlands District Council: No response to date.

### **Representations**

12. During the consultation period, the Authority has not received any representations regarding the proposals.

### **National Policy**

13. National Park designation is the highest level of landscape designation in the UK. The Environment Act 1995 sets out two statutory purposes for national parks in England and Wales: Which are; to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage and promote opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of national parks by the public. When national parks carry out these purposes they also have the duty to; seek to foster the economic and social well-being of local communities within the National Parks.
14. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has been revised (Published 19 February 2019). This replaces the previous document (2012) with immediate effect. The Government’s intention is that the document should be considered as a material consideration and carry particular weight where a development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date. In particular, Paragraph 172 asserts that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues.
15. In the National Park the development plan comprises the Authority’s Core Strategy 2011 and the Development Management Policies 2019. Policies in the Development Plan provide a clear starting point consistent with the National Park’s statutory purposes for the determination of this application. It is considered that in this case there is no significant conflict between prevailing policies in the Development Plan and government guidance in the NPPF with regard to the issues that are raised.

### **Main Development Plan Policies**

16. GSP1, GSP2, jointly seek to secure national park legal purposes and duties through the conversion and enhancement of the National Park’s landscape and its natural and heritage assets.

17. GSP3 requires that particular attention is paid to the impact on the character and setting of buildings and that the design is in accord with the Authority's Design Guide and development is appropriate to the character and appearance of the National Park.
18. DS1 supports extensions to existing buildings in principle, subject to satisfactory scale, design and external appearance.
19. Policy L1 identifies that development must conserve and enhance valued landscape character and valued characteristics, and other than in exceptional circumstances, proposals in the Natural Zone will not be permitted.
20. CC1 – Climate Change and Sustainability. Requires that all proposals:
  - A. Make the most efficient and sustainable use of land, buildings and natural resources.
  - B. Take account of the energy hierarchy by:
    - I. reducing the need for energy;
    - II. using energy more efficiently;
    - III. supplying energy efficiently; and
    - IV. using low carbon and renewable energy.
  - C. Be directed away from flood risk areas, and seek to reduce overall risk from flooding within the National Park and areas outside it, upstream and downstream.
  - D. Achieve the highest possible standards of carbon reductions.

#### Development Management Policies

21. DMC3 states that development will be permitted provided that its detailed treatment is of a high standard that respects, protects and where possible enhances the natural quality and visual amenity of the landscape, including the wildlife and cultural heritage that contribute to the distinctive sense of place.
22. With particular attention to (i) siting scale, form, mass, levels, height and orientation in relation to existing building, settlement form and character, including impact on open spaces, landscape features and the wider landscape setting which contribute to the valued character and appearance of the area; and (vi) the detailed design of existing buildings, where ancillary building, extensions or alteration are proposed; and (vii) amenity, privacy and security of the development and other properties that the development affects.
23. DMH7 states that extensions and alterations to dwellings will be permitted provided that the proposal does not detract from the character, appearance or amenity of the original building, its setting or neighbouring buildings.

#### Relevant Guidance

24. Supplementary Planning Guidance is provided in the 1987, 2007 and 2014 Design Guides.

### **Assessment**

#### Principle of Development

25. There are no objections in principle to extending a dwelling, subject to satisfactory scale, design and external appearance, with reference to appropriate design options for extensions supported within the Authority's Detailed Design Guidance SPD.
26. Development Management Policy DCM3 sets out criteria to ensure that detailed design is to a high standard. Amongst other things it refers to scale, form mass and orientation in

relation to existing buildings and the degree to which design details, material and finishes reflect or complement the style and tradition of local buildings.

27. The Development Management policy DMH7 states that extensions and alterations to dwellings will be permitted provided that the proposal does not detract from the character, appearance or amenity of the original building, its setting or neighbours buildings.

#### Design and Landscape Impacts

28. The proposed single storey orangery/boot room would replace a smaller extension. It would protrude 4.37m from the eastern elevation of the host dwelling and would be 6.79m in width. The boot room would be placed to south side of the orangery and would protrude 3.36m by 1.5m width. The existing extension has a simple pitched roof form that compliments the traditional and simple form of the host dwelling in line with the alterations and extensions SPD.
29. The Authority's Design guidance states that all extensions should harmonise with the host building and that it may be possible to add a well-designed extension in a modern style, provided it is in harmony with the original building and does not diminish its quality or integrity.
30. The proposed design would partially use materials to match the existing property, although a higher proportion would be oak framed, which does not reference or compliment the host dwelling. The host dwelling has a very traditional appearance with a strong linear form and narrow gabled ends. The house is simple and attractive. The proposed extension, with a hipped roof, oak frame, roof lantern and glazing that bears little resemblance to the window patter of the host dwelling, would have a very fussy appearance. It is neither traditional nor contemporary in appearance and gives the impression of a hybrid of a conservatory and a more solid extension. The design of the extension would not reflect the character of the host dwelling and nor would it provide a contemporary extension that would contrast well with the historic elements of the host dwelling.
31. The orangery/boot room spans about half of the east elevation and is too large, masking much of the original rear elevation of the property. The combination of the size of the extension and its inappropriate design would adversely affect the character of the host property. Therefore, the proposed extension design, siting, size, scale and massing would be harmful to the character of the host property, its setting and surrounding area.
32. During the course of the application we have tried to negotiate a different type of extension that would preserve the character of the host dwelling. The most successful option here is likely to be a traditional approach that reflects the detailing and style of the original building which ensures a close relationship between new and old. It might also be possible to explore using a more contemporary and light-weight approach that contrasts with but still the historic part of the proposed dwelling. Unfortunately, the proposed scheme achieves neither of these design principles. Amended plans were submitted that show a reduction to the amount of glazing and a reduction in the size of the roof lantern. However, these changes do not overcome the fundamental concerns about the size, form and design of the proposed extension. The scheme therefore remains unacceptable.
33. The site is set within isolated location although there is a public footpath that runs along the track directly through the farm yard 20m south of the proposed site. The orangery/boot room would be visible from this path.
34. The proposed orangery/boot room by virtue of its siting, size, scale and massing the

proposal would have a harmful impact on upon the character and appearance of the dwelling. As the proposal would be harmful to the character of the host building, it follows that there would be harm to the character of the immediate locality of this part of the National Park.

35. Therefore, the current proposal is contrary to saved Development Management policies DMC3 and DMH7. It also conflicts with advice contained in the Authority's Adopted Design Guidance.

#### Climate Change and Sustainability

A short statement is provided with the application which sets out that the wood used in the frame would be from sustainable sources and that the roof slate would be reclaimed. The application goes on to say that surface water could be diverted into a waterbutt and that the eastern facing elevation would help to maximise solar gain in the morning and door openings would provide ventilation. It is difficult to conclude that these measures genuinely make the maximum contribution possible to sustainability and mitigating climate change. The proposal is not in accordance with policy CC1.

#### Impact upon amenity

36. The proposal would not result in any significantly harmful overshadowing or oppressive impacts to any of the neighbouring properties. Given the separation distances between all other existing dwellings in the locality, it is considered that there would be no harm to the amenity of occupiers of any other nearby dwelling by way of overshadowing or oppressive impacts.
37. Whilst it is considered that the proposal would be harmful to the visual amenity of the immediate area, its position would not result in harm to the residential amenity of any neighbouring dwellings by way of overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing impact.

#### Conclusion

38. The proposed development, by virtue of the scale, form, design and massing fails to respect the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, and its setting. As such, the proposed development is contrary to Development Management policies DMC3 and DMH7. It also conflicts with advice contained in the Authority's Adopted Design Guidance.

#### Human Rights

39. Any human rights issues have been considered and addressed in the preparation of this report.

#### List of Background Papers (not previously published)

40. Nil

**Report Author:** Teresa MacMillan, Planning Assistant, 5 December 2019.