

Name of Applicant Type of Certificate	Proposal	Map/Plan Policy	Plan Ref. Expiry Date
Mr. Adams 'A'	Proposed dwelling – Land Adjoining 19 Summerfield Road, Holy Cross, Worcestershire, DY9 9RG	GB VENV	11/0329-SC 06.06.2011

RECOMMENDATION: that permission be **REFUSED**.

Councillor Mrs. J. M. Boswell has requested that this application be considered by the Committee rather than being determined under delegated powers.

Consultations

WH Consulted – view received 17.04.2011: Recommends that the permission be deferred subject to the submission of plans demonstrating satisfactory access, visibility splays and parking.

Belbroughton Parish Council Consulted 19.04.2011 – no comments received as yet.

Policy Consulted – view received 03/05/2011: Policy advice provided.

Trees Consulted 19.04.2011 – no comments received as yet.

DRNG Consulted – view received 03.05.2011: No objection.

Publicity Site notice posted 28/04/11, expires 19/05/11
1 neighbour notification letter posted 19/04/11 expires 10/05/11

4 representations in favour of the proposals received. Main points:

E-mail received from occupier 22 Summerfield Road, 05/05/2011:

“I would like to register my support for the above planning application put in by Mr Albert Adams relating to the construction of a detached property in Summerfield Road. I live at 22 Summerfield Road and feel that the development of a single detached property on the current "waste" land would enhance the character of the road.”

E-mail received from occupiers Meadowside, 04/05/2011:

“We believe the proposed development is entirely appropriate for the site, particularly taking into account it is located within Green Belt and the Clent village envelope and the planning policies which consequently apply. The land has been vacant for many years and it would be good to see a low key low density development on it. We do not believe the proposed dwelling is substantial, and it is in no way ostentatious or intrusive and would in our opinion be in keeping with the surrounding area. It can only improve the local neighbourhood as it is not currently

an appealing or attractive view and it has attracted fly tipping and other intrusion in the past. We hope the Council will agree with us that the proposed development is appropriate and grant the applicant planning consent.”

E-mail received from occupier 17 Summerfield Road, 05/05/2011:

Our family have lived at 17 Summerfield Road for 10 years, and are aware of the proposed new house proposed to be built under the above planning application.

I would like to confirm that we have no objection to this application, and think the house would make a good addition to the road.

E-mail received from occupier 75 Belbroughton Road, 05/05/2011:

I would like to support the above application as presented by Mr Albert Adams of 'Little Acre' Holy Cross, Clent.

Our family have lived at 17 Summerfield Road for 10 years, and are aware of the proposed new house proposed to be built under the above planning application.

I would like to confirm that we have no objection to this application, and think the house would make a good addition to the road.

The site and its surroundings

This application relates to an undeveloped parcel of green space located on the southern side of the junction of Summerfield Road with Belbroughton Road, adjacent the existing property at 19 Summerfield Road.

The site is within the Green Belt and within the designated Holy Cross village envelope.

Proposal

This application proposes a two-storey, dormer window style dwelling with attached single garage and car-port set forward of the main frontal elevation. The applicant is proposing a first floor extension to extend an existing bedroom by 1.5m and to create a new bathroom. A render finish is proposed and the existing double gable roof structure is to be continued with tiles to match existing.

Relevant Policies

WCSP	CTC1, CTC.5, D38, D39
BDLP	DS2, DS13, DS5, S9, TR11
Draft CS	CP3, CP17
Others	SPG1, PPS1, PPG2

Relevant Planning History

BR/436/1970 - Two dwellings with garages. – Granted (not implemented).
B7181 – Erection of two dwellings – Refused April 1980 – Appeal dismissed April 1982.
10/0483 - Proposed dwelling – Withdrawn 16.08.2010.
B/1995/0020 - Erection of two detached houses – Refused - 13.03.1995

Assessment

The main issue with this application is whether the proposed development is an appropriate form of development in the Green Belt and if not, whether very special circumstances exist to outweigh the level of harm caused.

It will also be necessary to consider the design of the proposal, its impact on the character of the street scene, its impact on the amenity of the nearby occupiers, technical matters relating to highways and drainage, and the views of third parties. I will deal with each matter under separate headings below.

Green Belt Policy

Policy D.39 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan and Policy DS2 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan 2004 are in general accordance with advice given under PPG2: Green Belts in stating that inappropriate development in the Green Belt will not be allowed unless very special circumstances exist to outweigh the harm caused. Policy DS2 reflects PPG2 is setting out the instances where development in the Green Belt may be considered appropriate. With regards to new dwellings, these instances are further defined by Policy S9 of the BDLP.

Policy S9 states that new dwellings will only be considered where the dwelling falls within the following categories.

- Required for forestry or agriculture.
- Re-use of a rural building.
- Affordable housing.
- Limited infill within the defined village envelope.
- Replacement dwelling.
- Sub-division of an existing dwelling.

The application site is located within the Village Envelope of Holy Cross and as such I refer to Policy DS5 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan 2004 (BDLP). This provides that within defined Village Envelope settlements limited housing infill may be acceptable. For the purposes of this policy 'limited infill' is defined as the development of sites located between existing development which are capable of accommodating no more than 2 dwellings, in a form which maintains the line and form of the existing buildings.

Whilst the application site is located within the Village Envelope of Holy Cross, it would not be located between existing development within the defined settlement. I am not therefore minded to treat the proposal as a form of infill development.

In any event, the explanatory text to Policy DS5 indicates that *'where gaps in frontages do occur there will be no automatic presumption in favour of development. For instance, it may be desirable to protect some 'gaps' from development because of the contribution of the site to the street scene or general character of the village or where it is desirable to retain views of the surrounding countryside'*.

In this instance I am of the view that it would be desirable to maintain this gap in the Village Envelope. The site is considered to serve an important Green Belt function by acting as a natural buffer between the Village Envelope Settlement of Holy Cross and the surrounding development to the south west of the site. Development in this location would have the effect of conjoining these two areas of existing development resulting in harm to the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land within it.

I am also of the view that the natural appearance of the site helps to preserve the rural character of the village when viewed from Belbroughton Road. Furthermore it is considered that the site helps to protect views into the open Green Belt from Summerfield Road.

As the proposal is not considered to represent an acceptable form of infill development, having regard to policies DS2 and S9 of the BDLP the proposal will be treated as an inappropriate form of development in the Green Belt.

Very Special Circumstances

In relation to Green Belts, the emphasis is on developers to demonstrate that very special circumstances exist to outweigh a proposal's harm to the Green Belt. The application's Design & Access Statement states,

"...it is argued for the applicant that very special circumstances apply in relation to this specific site given its visual appearance of unkempt ground, especially overgrown in the summer months is detracting from the rest of Summerfield Road. Further, the granting of permission also allows a replacement indigenous hedgerow to be provided to bound and screen the site."

Paragraph 1.5 of PPG2 lists the five purposes of including land within the Green Belt including "to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment" and paragraph 1.4, explains that one of the intentions of Green Belt policy is to keep land permanently open. It is noted that the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. As such, it is not viewed that the very special special circumstances put forward by the applicant carries weight to such an extent as to outweigh the harm to openness of the Green Belt that the proposal represents.

Design/Street Scene

This application proposes a two-storey, dormer window style dwelling with attached single garage and car-port set forward of the main frontal elevation. Though the garage and car-port are set forward, the proposals are careful to respect the existing building line on the southern side of Summerfield Road. Taken in isolation, the proposed dwelling is

considered to be of an acceptable design. The existing dwellings on Summerfield Road are two-storey and the scale of the proposal would not be incongruous in this context. However, it is the loss of the open character of the street scene at this conspicuous corner location that is viewed as harmful to visual amenity. The increased bulk of the proposed dwelling is therefore viewed as detrimental to this open and rural village vista.

Residential Amenity Issues

The proposed dwelling is set within a well sized plot and in respect of private amenity space, exceeds the total area required by SPG1. The proposed dwelling also raises no concerns in relation to privacy or overlooking and is viewed to be in accordance with the residential amenity guidelines as set out in SPG 1.

Highways and servicing issues

Policy TR11 of the BDLP requires all development to incorporate safe means of access and egress appropriate to the nature of the local highway network and to provide sufficient off-street parking. The County Highways Officer has been consulted with regards to the designs and has recommended that the application be deferred in order for the provision of further detail. I am of the view that, were members to grant permission, that this detail could be secured through attached conditions.

The Council's Drainage Engineer has been consulted and no objection has been raised subject to conditions requiring the submission of drainage details. On this basis, I consider that the development can be appropriately serviced.

Other matters

I note the letters of support received from a number of local residents. The points raised in these letters have been adequately addressed in the report sections above.

Conclusion

In conclusion, it is considered that the new dwelling is inappropriate development materially harmful to the openness of the Green Belt by virtue of its increased bulk. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to Policy DS2, DS5 and S9 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan, Policy D.39 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan and the provisions of PPG2: Green Belts. No very special circumstances have been put forward that would outweigh the harm that would be caused.

RECOMMENDATION: that permission be **REFUSED**.

1. It is considered that the new dwelling is inappropriate development materially harmful to the openness of the Green Belt. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to Policy DS2, DS5 and S9 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan, Policy D.39 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan and the provisions of PPG2:

Green Belts. No very special circumstances have been put forward that would outweigh the harm that would be caused.

2. The proposed dwelling would be a highly visible urban feature which would adversely impact on the character and visual amenity of the open village vista, which is considered contrary to CTC.1 of the Worcester County Structure Plan, Bromsgrove District Council's Residential Design Guide SPG 1, policy DS13 and S9 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan and the guidance in paragraph 3.15 of PPG2 Green Belts.