

Name of Applicant Type of Certificate	Proposal	Map/Plan Policy	Plan. Ref Expiry Date
Mr. N. Naveed 'A'	Cross Roads Garage, Kidderminster Road, Woodcote Green - Amended application - Proposed car showroom and shop (as amended by plans received on: 02/07/2007)	Green Belt	B/2007/0498 25/07/2007

**RECOMMENDATION:**

- (i) that permission be **REFUSED** and;
- (ii) Members should authorise appropriate action to secure the removal of the unauthorised structures and delegate authority to the Head of Planning and Environmental Services in consultation with the Head of Legal and Democratic Services to select the most appropriate course of action.

Consultations

Dodford PC	Consulted on: 01/06/2007. No objection: 15/06/2007.
WCC (HP)	Consulted 01/06/2007. No response to date.
ENG	Consulted 01/06/2007. No objection received on: 21/06/2007 subject to the satisfactory approval by the Local Planning Authority for the disposal of storm water.
FC	Consulted 01/06/2007. No response to date.
CEHO	Consulted 01/06/2007. No objection: 20/06/2007.
LP	Consulted 01/06/2007. Objection received on: 14/06/2007 summarised as follows: -  The proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The proposal would be in an unsustainable location.
EDO	Consulted on: 05/07/2007. No response to date.
Publicity	2 letters posted on: 01/06/2007 (expires on: 22/06/2007). Site notice posted on: 08/06/2007 (expires on: 09/06/2007). Objection received on: 20/06/2007, summarised as follows:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concerned about the position of the new window which would be approximately 4.5 metres from our showroom window.</li> <li>- The stair case opens into our yard.</li> <li>- My roof had to be down sized before permission was granted.</li> <li>- 11 car parking spaces as opposed to 6 on the previous permission will greatly restrict movement of traffic for the site which serves 3 business premises.</li> <li>- The first application was refused.</li> <li>- The second application was recommended for refusal, then approved.</li> <li>- I have objected to all applications and note that this has not been recognised for the approval of the second application.</li> <li>- The proposal would result in a loss of light and air.</li> </ul>

## The site and its surroundings

The application site lies on the north side of the Kidderminster Road at the junction with Fockbury Road, Dodford and lies within the designated Green Belt.

## Proposal

This is a retrospective application for an amended application ref. B/2004/0890 for a proposed car showroom and village shop which was granted permission by Members. This amended scheme refers to the implementation of a greater first floor area, including raising the height of the roof and the formation of a first floor level.

## Relevant Policies

WMSS	QE3
WCSP	SD.2, SD.3, SD.4, DS.5, SD.6, SD.7, SD.8, SD.9, D.28, .D35, D.38, D.39, T.1
BDLP	DS1, DS2, Ds3, DS6, DS13, TR8
Others	PPS1, PPG2, PPS6, PPS7, PPS13

## Relevant Planning History

B/2004/0890	Car showroom and village shop - resubmission of B/2003/0932. Granted: 14.10.2004.
B/2003/0932	Proposed car showroom, work shop and village shop. Refused: 17/11/2003.
B/2002/0812	Alternative showroom and workshop with workshop. Granted: 03/10/2002.
B/2002/0386	Alternative showroom and workshop with toilets. Withdrawn: 08/05/2002.
B/2000/0189	Projecting icons and shop sign. Advertisement Consent Granted: 19/04/2002.

## Notes and Green Belt Policy

The main issue to take into consideration is whether the impact of the amended scheme would entail any additional or significant harm to the openness/ visual amenity of the Green Belt in relation to the previous approved scheme which would be a 'fall-back' position for the applicant. If it is considered that greater harm would be caused then the proposal would, by definition constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and as such, it would be necessary to establish whether any 'very special circumstances' exist to clearly outweigh the harm caused.

## Fundamental differences between the two applications

For the purpose of assessing the impact between the previous approved scheme B/2004/0890 and this amended scheme B/2007/0498, I consider that a table format distinguishing the differences between the two should be used: -

Existing permission B/2004/0890	Proposed amendments B/2007/0498
<p><b>Height</b></p> <p><b>Front elevation</b> taken from central position to highest part of roof <b>7.5 metres</b>.</p> <p><b>Rear elevation</b> taken from central position to highest part of roof <b>7.5 metres</b>.</p>	<p><b>Height</b></p> <p><b>Front elevation</b> taken from central position to highest part of roof <b>8.3 metres</b>.</p> <p><b>Rear elevation</b> taken from central position to highest part of roof <b>8.3 metres</b>.</p>
<p><b>Side elevation (East)</b> small pitched roof suitable for the housing of the mezzanine floor.</p>	<p><b>Side elevation (East)</b> This elevation would involve the continuation of the existing roof line to cater for the proposed first floor provision.</p>
<p><b>Approximate floor space area of mezzanine floor:</b> 109m<sup>2</sup></p>	<p><b>Total proposed first floor:</b> 256m<sup>2</sup>.</p> <p>Therefore if the floor space of the mezzanine floor is deducted, a total additional floor space area of approximately 151m<sup>2</sup> would be created.</p>

### Summary

The previous building which was granted permission B/2004/0890 was predominantly a single storey building with a comparatively small, first floor mezzanine floor. This current scheme would involve infilling the existing space at ground floor level to create a significantly larger overall building and first floor level. Therefore I consider that the proposal would result in a building which would be of a greater, size, scale and bulky appearance which would be exacerbated further by its highly prominent corner position in the street scene and by definition the proposal would constitute an inappropriate development in the Green Belt. No 'very special circumstances' have been put forward to outweigh the harm caused and for the following reasons I recommend that permission be refused.

### **RECOMMENDATION:** that permission be **REFUSED:-**

- (i) The retrospective scheme would result in a building which would be of a greater, size, scale and bulky appearance which would be exacerbated further by its highly prominent corner position in the street scene. Therefore by definition the proposal would constitute an inappropriate form of development which would unduly harm the openness and visual amenity of the Green Belt. No 'very special circumstances' have been put forward to outweigh the harm caused and for the following reasons the proposal would contravene policy QE3 of the West Midlands Spatial Strategy, policies D.38, D.39 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan, policies DS1, DS2, DS3, DS6 and DS13 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan and the general provisions of PPG2 - Green Belts.
- (ii) Members should authorise appropriate action to secure the removal of the unauthorised structures and delegate authority to the Head of Planning and Environmental Services in consultation with the Head of Legal and Democratic Services to select the most appropriate course of action.