

Name of Applicant Type of Certificate	Proposal	Map/Plan Policy	Plan Ref. Expiry Date
<b>Worcestershire Care Group 'A'</b>	Rear extension to enhance specialised dementia care accommodation and meet latest care standards act requirements - 656 Birmingham Road, Bromsgrove	GB LPA AGLV	<b>B/2007/0717</b> 05.09.2007

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

**Councillor A. N. Blagg has requested that this application be considered by the Committee, rather than being determined under delegated powers.**

#### Consultations

Catshill PC	Consulted on: 13.07.2007. No response.
WCC (HP)	Consulted on: 13.07.2007. No response.
ENG	Consulted on: 13.07.2007. Comment received on: 07.08.2007. recommending that condition(s) be implemented.
Publicity	1 letter posted on: 13.07.2007 (expires on: 03.08.2007). Site notice posted on: 20.07.2007 (expires on: 10.08.2007). 2 Objections received. Summarised as follows: concerned about loss of light, visual intrusion, drainage issues.

#### The site and its surroundings

This application site refers to an existing nursing home which is located in a Green Belt, Landscape Protection Area and an Area of Great Landscape Value.

#### Proposal

Rear extension to enhance specialised dementia care accommodation and meet latest care standards act requirements.

#### Relevant Policies

WMSS	QE3
WCSP	SD.2, CTC.1, D.38, D.39, T.1
BDLP	DS2, DS6, DS13, C4, TR11
Others	PPS1, PPG2

#### Relevant Planning History (4 most recent only)

- B/2001/1349 Minor additions and alterations to nursing home. Granted: 14.01.2002.
- B/2001/0668 Rear extension for ancillary palliative care plus elevational improvements. Granted: 09.07.2001.
- B/1992/0509 Extensions / alterations to existing nursing home, 7 bedrooms, associated bathrooms / suites, treatment Room, staff room, laundry and owners living accommodation. Granted: 14.09.1992.
- B/1991/0371 Extension to nursing home. Refused: 17.06.1991.

## Notes

The main issue to take into consideration is whether the proposal would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and, if so, whether any 'very special circumstances' exist to clearly outweigh the harm caused.

**Previous history:** The existing building has been previously extended on a number of occasions and its current size and scale is already substantial and I attach substantial weight to these previous additions which have resulted in a further erosion of the countryside and the Green Belt. This application would involve a ground floor extension measuring approximately 68m<sup>2</sup> and a first floor extension of approximately 363m<sup>2</sup> which I consider to be a substantial, additional structure.

**Green Belt Policy:** Paragraph 3.4 of PPG2 states a number of criteria for what is considered to be appropriate development in the Green Belt and this proposal would not fall within any of these acceptable categories and, by virtue of size and scale, the proposal would lead to a cumulative bulk which would be significantly greater than the existing building. This would create a large, dominant structure which would constitute inappropriate development and would unduly harm the openness / visual amenity of the Green Belt to a much greater extent than the existing building. The applicants Agent has submitted a supporting statement to try and justify the proposal by stating that such works would be necessary to ensure that the home would comply with the latest environmental standards set out in the Care Standards Act.

However, whilst I do not dispute such comments, the main policy to take into consideration is PPG2 - Green Belts which aims to protect the countryside from further encroachment of urban sprawl. Therefore, whilst I acknowledge the comments from the Agent's supporting statement, I do not consider these to be 'very special circumstances' to clearly outweigh the harm caused to the openness / visual amenity of the Green Belt and the harm caused by this further development of the site would justify the refusal of the application.

**Harm to neighbouring occupiers:** The proposed two storey extension would result in additional light being lost and further unnecessary visual intrusion for the occupier of no. 658 Birmingham Road at the rear of the house and garden which is considered to be unacceptable. Clearly there is already some degree of light loss which has resulted from the previous extensions of the nursing home and, given the orientation of no. 658 and its easterly (rear) facing windows, the proposed first floor extension would further exacerbate this loss of light which would justify the refusal of the application.

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

- (i) The existing building has been subject to previous additions and the culmination of this and the proposed extensions would lead to a cumulative bulk which would be significantly greater than the existing building and would unduly harm the openness / visual amenity of the Green Belt. No very special circumstances have been put forward to the Local Planning Authority to clearly outweigh the harm caused to the openness / visual amenity of the Green Belt and by virtue the proposal would be contrary to policy QE3 of the West Midlands Spatial Strategy, policies SD.2, CTC.1, D.38, D.39, T.1 of the Worcestershire County Structure

Plan, policies DS2, DS6, DS13, C4, of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan and the general provisions of PPG2 - Green Belts.

- (ii) The proposed implementation of a two storey rear extension would result in further light being lost for the occupier of no. 658. This loss of light would be further exacerbated by the easterly orientation of no. 658 of the rear of the house and garden and would also result in further unnecessary visual intrusion. It is therefore considered that the proposal would unduly harm the amenities of this occupiers and by definition would be contrary to policy DS13 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan.