

Name of Applicant Type of Certificate	Proposal	Map/Plan Policy	Plan Ref. Expiry Date
<b>Mr. G. Underhill 'A'</b>	Proposed first floor side extension - 1 Holyoakes Lane, Tardebigge, Bromsgrove, B97 5SR	GB	<b>11/0383-TC</b> 28.06.2011

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

**Councillor Whittaker has requested this application is not dealt with under Delegated Powers but is taken to Planning Committee for determination.**

### Consultations

Bentley Paucefoot Parish Council	Response on 18.05.2011 - no objections.
Worcestershire County Council Highways	Response on 27.05.2011 - no objections.
Publicity	1 letter sent 11.05.2011 (expired 01.06.2011) - no views received. 1 site notice posted 17.05.2011 (expired 07.06.2011) - no views received.

### The site and its surroundings

This application relates to a semi detached residential property situated on the south western side of Holyoakes Lane, Bentley. The dwellinghouse is one of a small group of six properties set in a predominately open area of Green Belt land. The site has a detached side garage and a single storey side and rear extension already added to the original dwellinghouse.

### Proposal

First floor side extension including 3 no roof lights.

### Relevant Policies

WMSS	QE3
WCSP	CTC.1, D38, D39
BDLP	DS13, S11
DCS2	CP3, CP18, CP22
Others	PPS1, PPG2, SPG1, SPG7

### Relevant Planning History

B/1997/0897	Single storey kitchen extension, bathroom extension - granted 02.03.1998.
-------------	---

11/0104 Proposed first floor side extension including 2 no. roof lights - withdrawn  
13.04.2011

Notes

The site is located within the Green Belt thus the key issue in the determination of this application is the impact of the development on the openness of the Green Belt. It is important to consider the wider streetscape and design of the extension and the impact on the amenity of the neighbourhood. As such policies DS2, S11, SPG1 and SPG7 are most relevant in determining the application.

Given the location of the site within the Green Belt the application raises the following issues:

Greenbelt

Having regard to SPG7, a maximum extension of up to 40% of the original dwelling is regarded as a proportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling; unless there are very special circumstances.

Original dwelling (ground, first and rear outbuilding)	110.86sqm
Existing additions (side and rear extensions, minus garage)	25.93sqm
Existing dwelling	136.79sqm
Existing additions over original	23.38%
Proposed extension	24.65sqm
Proposed increase above existing	18.02%
Proposed increase above original	22.23%
Total house as proposed	161.44sqm
Proposed extension and existing additions	50.58sqm
% of proposed and existing additions above original	<b>45.62%</b>

The proposed extension would create an increase in size of 45.62% over and above the original dwelling, with total floor space of 161.44m<sup>2</sup>.

I note that where any buildings are to be demolished as part of the development, the floorspace of which can be offset against the proposed extensions. Even with the garage area removed the proposed extension and existing additions are above the proportionate 40% addition and is thus is not acceptable in the Green Belt unless very special circumstances apply.

The applicant has put forward a case for very special circumstances which will now be considered:

- The applicants calculations of the floorspace have been noted however the Council's calculations clearly show that the increase would exceed the recommended 40% increase even when taking into account the demolition of the

garage which is within 5 metres of the dwellinghouse. In addition the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance note 7, 'Extensions to dwellings in the Green Belt', only seeks additional increase in the Green Belt by floorspace and not volume and when assessing the proposed addition the proposal it is clearly above the 140 square metres and 40% recommended addition.

- The applicant suggests that the proposal may have very special circumstances as SPG7 notes that *'there may be cases where a further extension takes the cumulative effect above 40% of the original floor area, but where the design is such that it unifies previous extensions, such as single storey flat roof extensions'*. It is noted that the existing building has a pitched roof on the side element thus this proposal cannot be considered to be a single storey flat roof extension thus this case for very special circumstances does not apply in this instance. The proposal would have more weight if the existing addition was only flat roofed however the existing ground floor extension is predominantly pitched roof.
- The applicant also notes that the dwellinghouse is located at the end of a ribbon of residential development comprising 6 No. semi-detached cottages, all of which have been substantially extended. The applicant notes that:

*"All of the extensions [in the run of 6 dwellinghouses] greatly exceed 40% of the original floor area with one property being extended some 90%."* SPG 7 concurs that *'Where the dwelling house is located within a defined village settlement boundary or within a ribbon of residential development, then the relationship of the property to the type, scale and character of the adjoining development will be taken into consideration in evaluating the harm caused to the openness of the Green Belt'*.

Crucially, SPG7 clearly defines ribbon development as relating to "within a substantial line of dwellings with residential properties adjacent on either side. The property is situated at the end of a row of six dwellings and, given this context, I do not accept this point as constituting very special circumstances as advocated by SPG7.

It is now important to consider previous development along this stretch of Holyoakes Lane. No 6 Holyoakes Lane at the other end of the run has had 'extensions to the dwellinghouse' (B/1989/17879) granted 15 June 1989 and 'Erection of Double garage and extensions to dwelling' (B/1990/19720) granted 8 October 1990. I note that both of these extensions occurred before the adoption of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan 2004 and the guidance in PPG2 Green Belts (1995).

In addition the following development that has taken place within the run of development:

1. 4 Holyoakes Lane application for a two storey side extension which was granted in 11.12.2001 and the proposal was 104% approx over the original dwellinghouse (B/2001/1180).

2. 5 Holyoakes Lane application for a two storey side extension which was granted in 19.07.2001. The proposal was 88% over original dwellinghouse (B/2001/0652).
3. 3 Holyoakes Lane application for a two storey side extension granted on 05.12.2002. The proposal was 80% over the original dwellinghouse (B/2002/1176).

All these properties were determined prior to the adoption of SPG 7: 'extensions to dwellings in the Green Belt'. This guidance seeks to restrict extensions from being disproportionate and the previous applications did not take this into consideration. With this guidance it is clear that the proposed development is unacceptable in the Green Belt especially as very special circumstances do not apply.

- The applicant notes that "*precedents have been set in the past where Planning Permission has been granted for extensions to properties in the Green Belt which have resulted in the extended property being increased over and above the original floor space by substantially over 40%*".

One such example, a proposed first floor side extension and single storey rear extension at 8 Dordale Road in Bourneheath (B/2010/0829), noted by the applicant was seen to have very special circumstances in that the total floorspace of the proposed house would not exceed 140 square metres. The Council would state that all applications noted by the applicant were all assessed within their own context and circumstances and as such these do not provide any very special circumstances for development for the applicant and as such the proposed development is unacceptable in the Green Belt.

## Design

Development is permitted under DS2 if the proposals are for the limited extension, alteration or replacement of existing dwellings (subject to S11). The proposal should not damage the visual amenity of the Green Belt. All proposed materials are in line with the existing building and would thus not detriment the visual amenity of the building.

To comply with Bromsgrove District Council's Residential Guidelines, it is suggested that proposed extensions are set down from the height of the roof and set back from the front of the original dwelling. I will deal with these aspects of the application in turn:

**Set down** – the proposed roof would be set down 60 cm from the existing building.

**Set off** – the extension is set off approximately 7 metres from the site boundary.

**Set back** – The proposed extension is set back approximately 1.5 metres.

The proposal would be set back of the elevation of the original dwellinghouse, would be situated away from the curtilage boundary and would be set down by a reasonable margin from the existing building height. In addition the applicant notes in the supporting statement that "*The proposed first floor extension sits on the footprint of the existing ground floor extension which dictates the floor area generated.*" In addition it is noted that

the building would be enhanced in terms of design and it is noted that *“All proposed facing materials will be as original and the roofing material will be of reclaimed slate.”*

It is considered that the proposal would be subservient to the existing building and would be acceptable in terms of design.

### Street scene

It is noted that 1 Holyoakes Lane is at the end of a small group of properties and that the proposal seeks to place one rooflight in the front elevation. In terms of the roof light it is considered acceptable in the streetscape as no 2 Holyoakes Lane has a rooflight in a very similar location. Another rooflight is proposed in the roof at the front of the dwellinghouse visible to the side elevation facing the adjoining field. It is considered that this would cause negligible harm in the streetscape. The roof light to the rear would be acceptable.

By virtue of the position of the dwellinghouse at the end of the row of properties the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the character of the streetscene. Giving permission for development in this location would not give rise to a precedent for infilling of gaps as the property is at the end of the row of dwellinghouses.

### Residential amenity

The proposal would not cause material harm to the amenity of nearby occupiers. By virtue of the position of the extension at the end of the dwellinghouse there would be no impact to no 2 Holyoakes Lane.

### Conclusion

The proposal would be in keeping with the streetscene and design of the existing dwellinghouse and would not adversely affect the amenity of adjoining occupiers. However the application for a first floor side extension would create a disproportionate addition to the dwellinghouse and there are no very special circumstances to justify this development and as such would not meet the criteria for extensions to dwellings in the Green Belt (BDLP S11) and SPG7.

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

The extension would create would create a disproportionate addition to the original dwellinghouse, would be harmful to the openness and visual amenity of the Green Belt and no very special circumstances exist or have been put forward to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt, contrary to Policy S11 and DS13 of the Bromsgrove Local Plan and the guidance in PPS1, PPG2 and SPG 7 *'Extensions to dwellings in the Green Belt'*.