

Name of Applicant Type of Certificate	Proposal	Map/Plan Policy	Plan Ref. Expiry Date
<b>Mrs. S. Cook 'A'</b>	Extension of the existing property to provide improved disabled access (resubmission of 11/0047) - Annexe, Shut Mill Cottage, Shut Mill Lane, Romsley, B62 0LY	GB	<b>11/0413-RL</b> 06.07.2011

**RECOMMENDATION:** that planning permission be **REFUSED**.

### Consultations

Drainage Engineer	Consulted 18.05.11 – No objection received 31/5/11
Worcestershire Highways	Consulted 18.05.11 - No comments received to date
Romsley PC	Consulted 18.05.11 – No comments received to date
Publicity	Site Notice Posted 26.05.11 (expired 16.06.11) – No comments received to date 2 Neighbour Notification Letters Sent 18.05.11 (expired 08.05.11) – No comments received to date

### The site and its surroundings

This resubmitted application relates to the annexe between Shut Mill Cottage and Shut Mill Barn on the north side of Shut Mill Lane, Romsley which is located within the Land Protection Area and designated Green Belt.

Shut Mill Cottage and Shut Mill Annexe were devastated by severe flooding in 2008, following the over-topping of the embankment at the rear of Shut Mill Cottage in September 2008. This property and the annexe have been uninhabitable since and the owner and the occupant of the annexe have had to seek alternative accommodation. The cottage and the annexe are currently undergoing renovation as part of major engineering works to provide an improved outfall structure to the mill pond as part of the approved application referenced 10/0440.

### Proposal

The applicant is proposing to remove an existing unsightly porch on the front elevation which there are no records of any planning permission being granted for and re-building the front elevation of the building to be in line with the front wall of the demolished porch and a disabled ramp installed outside the newly positioned front door. The roof would be re-built but maintained at the same height by adding a leaded, flat top. The existing ventilator (often a common feature of converted rural buildings) would also be re-built. The internal configuration of the building would be altered to allow the additional space created by the proposed extension to be more easily utilised by the occupant. There would be two roof lights added to the rear roof slope of the building allowing more light into the new lounge along with a sun pipe above the new wc. There would be matching windows installed in the new front elevation and the bricks and tiles would be reclaimed to ensure they match the existing.

## Relevant Policies

WMSS	QE3
WCSP	CTC.1, D.38, D.39, D.16
BDLP	DS2, DS13, TR11, C27, C27C
DCS2	CP3
Others	PPS1, PPG2, SPG4

## Relevant Planning History

10/0440	Repairs to the existing mill pond embankment and construction of new spillway and associated works (as amended by drawings received 05.07.10). Approved 27.07.10
11/0047	Extension to existing property to provide improved disabled access. Withdrawn 09.05.11

## Notes

I consider the main issues with this application to be whether the proposals are considered appropriate development in the Green Belt and if not whether there are any very special circumstances which would outweigh the harm caused. The proposal must also be considered in terms of its design to comply with the SPG4 Conversion of Rural Buildings:

### Green Belt issues

I consider that the proposal, as an extension of a converted rural building (where permitted development rights have been removed) is inappropriate development in the Green Belt which is, by definition harmful. The proposal would result in a loss of openness at the site compared with the present situation as it would have a larger footprint than the building in situ. The extension does not fall into any of the categories of development in the Green Belt which would be considered appropriate.

On this basis, a case for very special circumstances has been put forward by the applicant within the submitted Design and Access Statement. This is summarised below:

- The proposed extension and alterations are to provide improved level access to the property and a bathroom and wc facilities that are suitable for wheelchair access.
- The height of the proposed roof would be lower than that of the existing roof.

Whilst I sympathise with the applicant in that the changes are required to ensure greater ease of movement for the occupant due to disability, this cannot be considered as a VSC which would outweigh the harm caused to the openness of the Green Belt.

The height of the roof may not be increasing in height, but by increasing the volume of the building would also cause harm to the openness of the Green Belt by increasing the overall bulk of the building. The height of the proposed roof not increasing cannot therefore be considered a VSC in this case.

Having consideration to the case put forward for very special circumstances, on balance I do not consider these to be very special to outweigh the harm that would be caused to the Green Belt.

### Residential amenity

Given the orientation of the buildings and that the proposed front elevation would be set back from the front wall of the neighbouring property (Shut Mill Barn), I am confident that the proposed extension and alterations would not have a detrimental affect on the amenities of the neighbouring property with regard to loss of light or outlook. There would also not be any loss of privacy as a result of the proposed works.

### Character and Design

Policy C27C of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan states that proposals for extensions to converted rural buildings will be assessed against the impact of the scheme on the character of the original building rather than the use to which it has been converted. The key element is therefore the form and style of the original building rather than the primary use to which it has been converted. Paragraph 3.7 of SPG4 'Conversion of Rural Buildings' mirrors Policy C27c by stating that extensions will not normally be permitted where the proposed works detract from the plain, simple and utilitarian appearance of the original building.

By virtue of its siting, I consider the proposal would detract from the simple and utilitarian appearance of the building. With regards to its design, I do not consider that there has been significant effort made to reflect the original character of the building notwithstanding the proposed matching brickwork, tiled roof and the attempt to retain the ventilator characteristic. The proposed windows and door appear to be those which would be used in a residential property rather than a building previously attached to an agricultural use. Despite the proposed extension removing the unsightly porch to the front of the property, the character and footprint of the building would be changed to such a great an extent to have irretrievable damage to the original form of the building as it would have been prior to conversion. On the basis of the above, I consider the proposal would appear simply as a modern extension which would be harmful to the character of the building. On balance, I do not consider the proposal accords with policy C27C or the guidance of SPG4.

### Conclusion

I consider the form and general design of the proposed extension would detract from the simple and utilitarian form and appearance of the existing building contrary to Policy C27C of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan and the guidance contained in SPG4. I therefore consider the application to be unacceptable. The proposal also amounts to inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

**RECOMMENDATION:** that planning permission be **REFUSED**.

1. The siting, form and design of the proposed extension would detrimentally erode the simple form and utilitarian character and appearance of the original building contrary to Policy DS2 and C27C of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan; the

**Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 4 'The Conversion of Rural Buildings' and Policy D.16 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan.**

2. The proposed extension would be harmful to the openness of the Green Belt and no very special circumstances have been put forward to justify it. Therefore, the proposal conflicts with policies D38 and D39 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan, policy DS2 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan and the advice of PPG2.