

Name of Applicant Type of Certificate	Proposal	Map/Plan Policy	Plan Ref. Expiry Date
Mr. G. Crofts 'A'	Erection of new conservatory - Gorse Lane Farm, Scarfield Hill, Alvechurch, Birmingham, B48 7DB	GB LPA	11/0682-SG 13.10.2011

RECOMMENDATION that permission be **REFUSED**.

Councillor P. J. Whittaker has requested that this application be considered by the Committee, rather than being determined under delegated powers.

Consultations

WH	Consulted 22.08.2011, expired 05.09.2011 - no objection.
Tutnall and Cobley PC	Consulted 22.08.2011, expired 12.09.2011 - no objection.
RA	Consulted 22.08.2011, expired 05.09.2011 - no comment.
WCC (PROW)	Consulted 22.08.2011, expired 12.09.2011 - no comment.
WCC (Mins and Waste)	Consulted 22.08.2011, expired 12.09.2011 - no objection.
Publicity	Site notice posted 02.09.2011, expired 23.09.2011. Press notice published 08.09.2011, expired 29.09.11. No objections received.

The site and its surroundings

This application relates to a detached two storey house with single storey detached outbuildings located on the north side of Gorse Lane, Alvechurch. The site occupies a relatively remote location with open countryside surrounding the site. The site is located in a landscape protection area in the Green Belt.

Proposal

A new conservatory is proposed to adjoin the south elevation of the dwellinghouse. The conservatory would have dimensions of 4.7m x 4.0m x 4.0m (h).

Relevant Policies

WMSS	QE3
WCSP	CTC.1, D38, D39
BDLP	DS2, DS13, S11, C4
DCS2	CP3
Others	PPS1, PPG2, SPG1, SPG7

Relevant Planning History

11/0398	Proposed new entrance lobby and bed sitting room annex (as amended by plans received 02.08.2011). Granted 04.08.2011.
B98/0292	Two storey extension comprising utility room and study. Granted 13.07.1998

BR/757/1972 Additions to dwelling. Granted 22.08.1972

B/84/1974 Extension to lounge and rebuilding boundary wall. Granted 03.06.1974

Assessment

The key issues in the determination of this application are the impact of the development on the openness of the Green Belt and on the amenity of the neighbourhood. As such policies DS2 and S11 of the BDLP, D39 of the WCSP and SPG1, and SPG7 are most relevant in determining the application.

Green Belt

The floor space of the original dwelling is taken to be 241.765m². The house has been extended with two 2-storey rear extensions (under BR/757/1972 and B/1998/0292), and a lounge extension (under B/84/1974). The existing additions have a combined floor space area of 142m² which constitutes an increase of 58.8% over the size of the original house. A small extension representing 5.24m² of floor space has recently been allowed under 11/0398. Together with the existing additions, following the build of the recently approved development (under 11/0398); the extensions would constitute an increase of 60.9% over the size of the original house.

The proposed conservatory would create a further 18.8m². Taken together with the existing extensions and small pipeline development (under 11/0398); the proposal would create total additions of 68.6% over and above the size of the original house. It is important to note that the proposal represents a 4.9% increase over and above the size of the existing house.

The applicant has submitted supplementary information (dated 18.10.2011) which contest some of the calculations provided above. This information indicates that the original porch, single storey rear extensions (labelled 2, 4 + 6 in Schedule 1) and the third floor of the rear part of the house (labelled 1A in Schedule 1) have not been included in the floor space calculations for the original house. In view of the fact that these parts of the original house have been demolished and replaced with new extensions I do not consider the floorspace of these parts of the house should be attributed to the size of the original house. With regards to the size of the original outbuilding, I concur with agent's assessment which indicates that the floorspace of the upper floor of one barn was not included and that the addition of the barn was under-assessed. In taken these inaccuracies into account, I take the original house to be 254.36m² and total extensions to be 146.1m² which equates to existing additions over and above the size of the house to be 57.4%.

Notwithstanding these discrepancies, the applicant agrees that the house has been extended by 60% over and above its original size.. Members will note therefore that the house has already been increased at 20% above the Council's 40% allowance stipulated in SPG7.

Having regard to SPG7, I note that a maximum extension of up to 40% of the original dwelling may be regarded as a proportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling; unless there are very special circumstances. On this basis it is for me to

consider whether there are any very special circumstances that would outweigh the harm that would be caused to the openness of the Green Belt.

By virtue of its siting, the proposed conservatory would not be attached to any part of the original house and instead, would be attached to the side wall of the 2-storey rear extension approved in 1972. The conservatory would therefore fail to meet criterion (h) of Class A, Part 1, Schedule 2 of the GPDO 2008 (for side extensions) in view of the fact that the extension would not extend beyond a side wall forming a side elevation of the original dwellinghouse. Having reference to CLG's Technical Guidance August 2010, the cumulative impact of extensions is also important to consider when assessing whether a development is permitted development. In this instance the cumulative impact of the development, by virtue of its attachment to the 2-storey rear extension approved in 1972 would go beyond the measurement allowances for rear and side extensions under Class A of the permitted development rights. For the reasons above, I do not consider the extension has a convincing permitted development fall back position to represent a very special circumstance to justify the granting of planning permission.

Furthermore, although the development cannot be seen from the highway, this does not make it appropriate development since this argument could be used time and time again. Lack of harm, in itself, does not amount to very special circumstances.

PPG2 places emphasis on the applicant to show why permission should be granted in proving very special circumstances exist to justify the development.

I do not consider any other very special circumstances exist or have been put forward to outweigh the harm that would be caused to the openness of the GB.

Street scene

By virtue of its matching materials, single storey scale and siting towards the rear of the house concealed largely by the existing outbuilding (or entrance lobby when built as approved under 11/0398); I do not consider the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the character or appearance of the street scene.

Residential amenity

By virtue of its scale and isolated position between the main house and outbuilding; I am content that the proposal would not cause harm to residential amenity.

Conclusion

The proposal represents a disproportionate addition to the original house and no very special circumstances have been found to exist that would outweigh the harm that would be caused to the Green Belt.

RECOMMENDATION: that permission be **REFUSED**.

1. It is considered that the proposed extension to the dwelling is inappropriate development in the Green Belt because the cumulative impact of the proposals 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 policy S11 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan, policy D.39 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan and the guidance contained in SPG7 and PPG2. No arguments exist or have been put forward to support the development that amount to very special circumstances that would outweigh the harm that would be caused to the Green Belt.