SCHEDULE A: Applications with Recommendation

Item No: 07	D	ate of Committee: 11/04/2014	
Appn Ref No: 14/0013	Applicant: Mr Swainson	Parish: Burgh-by-Sands	
	Agent: Gray Associates Limi	Ward: ited Burgh	
Location: Bramblebeck Cottage, Moor Park, Thurstonfield, Carlisle, CA5 6HB			
Proposal: Change Of Use Of Small Area Of Field To Residential; Erection Of Detached Domestic Garage			

Date of Receipt:	Statutory Expiry Date	26 Week Determination
05/02/2014	02/04/2014	

REPORT

Case Officer: Richard Maunsell

1. Recommendation

1.1 It is recommended that this application is refused.

2. Main Issues

- 2.1 Whether The Proposal Is Appropriate To The Dwelling
- 2.2 The Impact On The Character And Appearance Of The Area
- 2.3 The Impact Of The Proposal On The Living Conditions Of Neighbouring Residents
- 2.4 Biodiversity

3. Application Details

The Site

- 3.1 Moorpark Farm is located between Moorhouse and Thurstonfield and is immediately adjacent to the B5307 County highway. Moorhouse is approximately 590 metres to the east and Thurstonfield lies 570 metres to the west.
- 3.2 The site comprises of a one and a half storey detached dwelling constructed

from facing brick under a slate roof. The property is set back some 14.5 metres from the front boundary which itself comprises of a 1 metre high stone wall. The property is situated within a reasonable curtilage.

3.3 The vehicular access is located to the west of the property which is taken from one of the farm entrances. Beyond the access to the west, are a series of modern agricultural buildings and the original farmhouse. The property and the farm steading are enveloped by open countryside.

Background

3.4 When outline planning permission was granted for the dwelling in 2002, the consent included the provision of a curtilage 14.5 metres to the front of the property and 12.5 metres to the rear. At the time of the Officer's site visit in the assessment of this application, the rear boundary was only approximately 5 metres from the back of the house some 7.5 metres short of its consented position. As the planning permission has been implemented, the boundary could be extended and the remaining land used as curtilage without the need for further consent.

The Proposal

- 3.5 This application seeks "Full Planning" permission for the change of use of agricultural land to domestic curtilage together with the erection of a detached garage. The land would be to the south-east corner of the property between the house and the road. The area of agricultural land measures approximately 91 square metres in area and the garage would be sited mainly on this land and partially within the existing domestic curtilage.
- 3.6 The double garage would encompass a storage area at the southern end and would be single storey. The structure would be constructed from facing brickwork incorporating a stone plinth and stone detail under a slate roof. The gable of the garage would face the highway and vehicles would access the garage from the existing entrance to the property and across the front of the dwelling.

4. Summary of Representations

4.1 This application has been advertised by means of a site notice and direct notification to the occupier of a neighbouring property. No representations have been received.

5. Summary of Consultation Responses

Cumbria County Council - (Econ. Dir. Highways & Transportation): - no objection;

Burgh-by-Sands Parish Council: - the following objections have been received:

- 1. it extends the property into a green-field site and there is adequate space on the existing site for a garage;
- 2. it will affect the views of an open space within Burgh Moor;
- 3. there is no visible route of access.

6. Officer's Report

Assessment

6.1 The relevant planning policies against which the application is required to be assessed are the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Policies CP1, CP2, CP5 and H11 of the Carlisle District Local Plan 2001-2016 and the Supplementary Planning Document "Achieving Well Designed Housing". The proposal raises the following planning issues.

1. Whether The Proposal Is Appropriate To The Dwelling

- 6.2 The proposed garage would be located forward of the front elevation close to the boundary with the highway and would be proximately visible within the character of the area. Due to its siting, the scale and overall size of the building would result in an obtrusive development that would be poorly related to the existing dwelling and would be inappropriate to its setting.
- 6.3 The proposed garage, therefore, constitutes development inconsistent with the requirements of Policy H11 of the Local Plan and the Supplementary Planning Document "Achieving Well Designed Housing" which seeks to ensure that extensions are of an appropriate scale and must not dominate the original dwelling.

2. The Impact On The Character And Appearance Of The Area

- 6.4 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on the 27th March 2012 and sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied, and is a material consideration in planning decisions. The document places an emphasis on the promotion of sustainable growth whilst also protecting the environment.
- 6.5 The guidance sets out a number of core land-use planning principles in paragraph 17, which underpin both plan-making and decision-taking. The core principles embrace good design and protect character, stating that planning should; *"always seek to secure high quality design and good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings;"* and *"take account of the different roles and character of different areas, promoting the vitality of our main urban areas, protecting the Green Belts around them, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving rural communities within it".* The requirement for good design is further emphasised in paragraph 64 stating 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."*

- 6.6 The land on which the building would be sited would be approximately 0.5 metres higher than the level of the adjoining road. The view when approaching from Moorhouse would be of the rear elevation of the building, an expanse of 9 metres, although this would be partially screened by the hedgerow to the adjoining field, the roof would clearly still be visible. When approaching from the opposite direction, due to the low stone wall to the front of the property, would expose the site and enhance the prominence of the building. Due to the scale and siting of the building and the elevated nature of the land, the development would not be well related to the existing property and would adversely affect the character and appearance of the area.
- 6.7 To assist the applicant in achieving the objective of building a garage, Officers advised that the curtilage of the property could be extended to the rear in accordance with the extant consent and the proposed garage resited. Subject to a slight reduction in height, the building may then be exempt from planning permission. In response, a short reply was received verbally from the agent to the effect that this would affect the visibility to the adjacent farm buildings thereby affecting the security of the farm.
- 6.8 Although security can be a material consideration, in this instance the garage would not inhibit direct views over the junction of the farm access with the County highway and with visibility over the entrance to the property and much of the farm access unaffected. Anyone passing would not be able to do so unnoticed.
- 6.9 In addition, there are a 2 other entrances to the farm which are not visible from the property and the applicant's are unable to monitor most of the farm buildings which are, themselves, screened by other farm buildings. Therefore, limited weight is attached to this argument which is outweighed by the adverse visual impact that would result on the character of the area.

3. The Impact Of The Proposal On The Living Conditions Of Neighbouring Residents

6.10 Whist planning policies may allow the principle of development, policies also require that consideration is also given to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. The only property close to the application site is Moorpark Farm which is within the same ownership and separated by agricultural buildings. Given the orientation of the application site with this properties, the occupiers would not suffer from an unreasonable loss of daylight or sunlight. The siting, scale and design of the development will not adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties and the proposal will not result in a loss of privacy or unreasonable overlooking.

4. Biodiversity

6.11 The Councils GIS Layer has identified that the site has the potential for protected species to be present on or in the vicinity of the site. As the proposed development is partly within the curtilage of an existing dwelling and involves development of agricultural land, it is not considered that the

development would harm a protected species or their habitat. Natural England's standing advice states that in this instance, no protected species surveys are required but works should proceed with caution requires that an Informative should be included within the decision notice ensuring that if a protected species is found all work must cease immediately and the Local Planning Authority informed.

Conclusion

6.12 In overall terms, the property is within a large plot and the principle of additional domestic accommodation on the site is considered to be acceptable; the scale of the garage would be disproportionate and obtrusive to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling. The design is not reflective of the existing property and in combination of these factors, the development would adversely affect the wider landscape character and the proposal would conflict with the objectives of the relevant Local Plan policies and Supplementary Planning Document.

7. Planning History

- 7.1 Outline planning permission was refused in 2002 for the erection of a bungalow to house an agricultural worker.
- 7.2 In 2002, outline planning consent was granted for the erection of an agricultural workers bungalow and formation of a new access.
- 7.3 Planning permission was granted in 2003 for the erection of a former bungalow for occupation by an agricultural worker.
- 7.4 In 2004, planning consent was granted for a revised proposal for the erection of a dormer bungalow for occupation by an agricultural worker following the approval of outline planning consent.

8. Recommendation: Refuse Permission

1. **Reason:** The proposal, by virtue of its scale, massing and position within the site would not be well related to the existing building. The garage would be visually dominant within the site and would result in an awkward intrusion into open countryside. In this location, the proposal represents an inappropriate development that would result in a discordant feature within the rural area and due to the aforementioned reasons would be detrimental to the character of the local landscape. The proposal is therefore contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy H11 (Extensions to Existing Residential Dwellings) of the Carlisle District Local Plan 2001-2016.





