

**Appeal made against the refusal of planning permission**

|                             |  |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <b>Appeal reference</b>     | APP/P1805/D/11/2154285                                       |
| <b>Planning Application</b> | 11/0063-SC   |
| <b>Proposal</b>             | First floor bedroom extension and enlarged rear conservatory |
| <b>Location</b>             | Chadwich Mill Cottage, Wildmoor Lane, Bromsgrove, B61 0RE    |
| <b>Ward</b>                 | Woodvale   |
| <b>Decision</b>             | Refused (Delegated decision) - 30th March 2011               |

The author of this report is Stuart Castle who can be contacted on 01527 881342 (e-mail: [s.castle@bromsgrove.gov.uk](mailto:s.castle@bromsgrove.gov.uk)) for more information.

**Discussion**

The proposal is for a first floor bedroom extension and enlarged rear conservatory.

The application was determined under delegated powers and refused due to the following reasons as detailed below:

1. 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. No arguments 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.

The Inspector found the main issue to be:

Whether the proposed extensions represent appropriate development in the Green Belt and, if not, are there any very special circumstances which outweigh the harm, or any other harm, and would justify granting permission.

**Discussion**

The application site lies in the West Midlands Green Belt, where there is a presumption against inappropriate development.

The proposed extensions would bring the overall figure to 188.59 sq m, or 140% above the size of the original. The proposed scheme is, therefore, contrary to the relevant policies of the development plan where a maximum enlargement of 40% the original dwelling (as it existed at 1st July 1948), would be permissible. Therefore the development must be regarded as inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Whilst the Inspector found the proposed extensions would be, in themselves, relatively modest, if implemented, what was once a small rural cottage will have become, through the cumulative effect of successive enlargements, a substantial house with a distinctly different character. Although at least partially screened by hedges and by the main house from some viewpoints, the enlargements would be noticeable. Albeit to a small degree, this would erode the openness of the Green Belt.

### **Very special circumstances**

In short the Inspector deems there are no very special circumstances which would justify granting permission, after carefully considering the appellants case for such circumstances. These include; the applicant's argument that the proposed development is "very, very close" to the acceptable limits for house extensions allowed under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (as amended). However, no details were then provided to explain how close the proposed scheme is to the permitted development allowance. It was also argued by the appellant that the extensions are required to accommodate the appellant's growing family. The wish for a larger house does not represent very special circumstances. Finally attention was drawn to visually intrusive or unsympathetic buildings in the vicinity which are claimed by the appellant to be incongruous in the Green Belt. The Inspector noted, it is not clear whether these were permitted in accordance with the operative development plan policies or not. Nevertheless, they were not regarded as desirable examples to follow in this appeal.

### **In conclusion**

The Inspector found the proposal to not represent appropriate development in the Green Belt and, from the evidence submitted with the appeal, there are no very special circumstances which would justify granting permission. Accordingly, the proposed scheme conflicts with the objectives of the development plan policies.

Therefore, the Inspector dismissed the appeal.

### **Costs application**

No application for costs was made.

**Appeal outcome**

The appeal was **DISMISSED** (22nd August 2011).

**Recommendation**

The Committee is asked to **RESOLVE** that the item of information be noted.