

Name of Applicant Type of Certificate	Proposal	Map/Plan Policy	Plan Ref. Expiry Date
Dr. J. Jenkins 'A'	Proposed two storey rear extension installing safer staircase - Brake Mill Cottage, Hagley, DY8 2XY	GB	11/0442-RL 26.07.2011

Councillors S. R. Colella and C. R. Scurrell have requested that this application be considered by the Committee, rather than being determined under delegated powers.

RECOMMENDATION: that permission be **REFUSED**.

Consultations

Ramblers Association	Consulted 02.06.2011 - No comments received to date.
PROW Officer	Consulted 02.06.2011 - No comments received to date.
WH	Consulted 02.06.2011 - No objection received 22.06.2011.
Hagley PC	Consulted 02.06.2011 - Comments received 20.06.2011: Request that the application is called in due to there being a strong 'fall-back' position when considering what could be constructed under pd and the developments which have been previously approved in Certificate of lawfulness applications.
Publicity	Site notice posted 09.06.2011 (expired 30.06.2011). No comments received to date.

The site and its surroundings

This application relates to a detached cottage located at the end of Brake Mill, off Stakenbridge Lane, Hagley which is located within designated Green Belt. The plot is 'V' shaped and bounded on the east and west sides by Public Footpaths. Beyond the footpath to the west is a wood and to the north are agricultural fields. The property has been previously extended to the rear and had applied for two certificates of lawfulness for outbuildings which were both determined to be permitted development.

Proposal

The applicant is proposing a two-storey rear extension to create a kitchen extension and utility on the ground floor with a new bedroom above including an en-suite with internal alterations to the ground and first floor room layouts. The proposed extension would project 3.9m from the existing rear wall of the previous extension and would have a dual ridged roof of maximum height 6.7m.

Relevant Policies

WMSS	QE3
WCSP	CTC1, D38, D39
BDLP	DS2, DS13, S11

Relevant Policies (cont'd)

DCS2 CP3
Others SPG1, SPG7, PPS1, PPG2

Relevant Planning History

B/2003/0175 Demolition of existing single storey annex and construction of 2-storey extension to rear - approved 19.03.2003
10/0656 Certificate of Lawfulness application for the construction of 2 outbuildings conforming to class E of the GDPO - PD 14.09.2010
10/0956 Certificate of Lawfulness application for the construction of 2 outbuildings - PD 14.12.2010
11/0168 Amendments to 10/0956 to increase the floor area of the proposed utility room - PD 28.03.2011

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 and whether the proposed extension would have a detrimental affect on the amenities of the neighbouring properties.

Green Belt issues

Due to the property being located within designated Green Belt, SPG7 Extensions to Dwellings in the Green Belt states that proposals should be proportionate to the size of the original dwelling and therefore any extension should not be greater than 40% above the floor space of the 'original' dwelling unless there are VSC's which exist to outweigh any harm caused to the openness of the Green Belt. The table below shows the calculations:

Original dwelling (ground and first floor)	154.3 sqm
Previous extensions (B/2003/0175)	56.98 sqm
% increase above original	67.9%
Proposed extension	58.5 sqm
Total % increase above original dwelling	141.2 %

As the proposed extension would increase the property by a total of 141.2% which is over the 40% limit as specified within SPG7, a case for VSC's would need to be submitted which would demonstrate any reasons to justify the reason for the development which would outweigh the harm caused to the openness of the Green Belt. In this case, the justification for the development relates to there being a strong 'fall-back' position in the applicant's opinion. Relating to the fact that there have been two Certificate of Lawfulness applications previously submitted for two outbuildings which would create more ground cover than the proposed two-storey extension applied for and hence have a greater affect on the openness of the Green Belt and detract from the cottage and its

simple lines and harm the rear of the building when viewed from the adjacent footpaths. I am not in agreement with the argument that two single storey buildings would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than a two-storey extension as by virtue of the height, a two storey extension would have a greater impact than a single storey structure. I note the 'fall back' position. However, Members should be aware that the proposed extension could be built together with the largest single storey, which could be built under Permitted Development as per Certificate of Lawfulness ref. 11/0168, and this would therefore still create greater harm to the openness of the Green Belt. Whilst I consider that there would be an argument for VSC's in this case, I do not consider that sufficient weight should be given to this 'fall-back' position given that the proposed extension would be two-storey and the Certificates relate to single storey structures only. I consider that as the proposed extension would result in a dwelling which would be a lot greater in size than is deemed to be proportionate within SPG7, that the proposed extension is inappropriate development within the Green Belt with the VSC's not outweighing the potential harm caused to the openness of the Green Belt.

Residential Amenity

In accordance with guidance within SPG1 Residential Design Guide and policy S11 of the BDLP, there should be no detrimental affect on the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers by reason of loss of light, outlook or privacy. In this case, as the property has no immediate neighbours, the proposed extension would not have any detrimental affect on any neighbouring property.

Conclusion

Despite a case for VSC's being submitted in support of this proposal and it having no detrimental affect on any neighbouring property, I do not give this substantial weight in which to justify the approval of this development.

RECOMMENDATION: that permission be **REFUSED**.

It is considered that the extension to the dwelling is inappropriate development in the Green Belt because the impact of the proposal would constitute a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling. The proposal would unacceptably harm the openness of the Green Belt, contrary to policies DS2 and S11 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan, policy D.39 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan, the provisions of SPG7 and the guidance contained in PPG2. The arguments which have been put forward to support the development are not considered to be acceptable as very special circumstances which would outweigh the harm that would be caused to the Green Belt.