

Name of Applicant Type of Certificate	Proposal	Map/Plan Policy	Plan Ref. Expiry Date
Mrs. Laura Javid	Demolition Of Single Storey Wing and Full Refurbishment and Extension.	Green Belt Landscape Protection Area	12/0411-HR 19.07.12
“A”	The Ridgeway, Alcester Road, Finstall, Bromsgrove, B60 1EW.		

RECOMMENDATION: that permission be **GRANTED**.

Consultations

WH	Consulted: 30.05.2012 - No objection.
Tree Officer	Consulted: 30.05.2012 – No comments received.
Tutnall And Cobley Parish Council	Consulted: 30.05.2012 – No comments received
Publicity	Site Notice posted 13.06.12; expires 04.07.12 No adjacent occupiers.

The site and its surroundings

The application site relates to a two storey detached dwelling located on Alcester Road, Finstall, Bromsgrove which is situated within a Landscape Protection Area and within the Green Belt as defined in the Bromsgrove District Local Plan 2004. The boundary treatment on all sides consists of mature trees and hedges and pedestrian and vehicular access to the property is via an existing timber gated driveway off Alcester Road. A detached structure is located to the rear garden.

Proposal

This application proposes to demolish the existing single storey side extension and the existing rear conservatory and erect a two storey side extension and front porch. The proposal would comprise of a front kitchen and a rear playroom, utility room, airing cupboard and store at ground floor. A master bedroom and en-suite is proposed at first floor with three roof lights to the front elevation and one roof light to the rear elevation. The existing second floor photographic studio would be converted to a fifth bedroom.

Relevant Policies

WMSS	QE3
WCSP	CTC1, D38, D39.
BDLP	TR11, DS2, DS13, S11, C1, C4,
DCS2	CP3, CP22
Others	SPG1, SPG7, NPPF

Relevant Planning History

12/0145 Demolition of single storey wing and full refurbishment and extension.
Withdrawn: 19.03.2012

B/3097/1976 Extension to side of existing garage: Granted: 01.02.1977

Assessment

The main considerations in this application are:

- (i) whether the proposal would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt
- (ii) whether the proposals design would be acceptable
- (iii) whether the proposal would constitute any residential amenity issues.
- (iv) whether the proposal would have a detrimental affect on the Landscape Protection Area

Green Belt Policy

With respect to the NPPF recent adoption, it is imperative to note that Planning Policy Guidance note 7 (SPG7): Extensions to Dwellings in the Green Belt, is consistent with Section 9 of the NPPF: Protecting Green Belt land, and namely paragraph 89 which explicitly states that an extension or alteration of a building would be considered as appropriate provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.

SPG7 for Extensions to dwelling in the Green Belt states that a maximum extension of 40% of the original dwelling or a maximum total floor space of 140 m². (i.e. the original dwelling plus extension) may be regarded as a proportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling. This relates to all habitable floor space measured externally. Extensions over this size will normally be regarded as disproportionate additions.

What is Original?

The original dwelling had a floor space area of approximately 169.15m².

% increase? Is development appropriate?

The proposal would equate to an additional 76.72m² of floor space.

$$\frac{(\text{sum of proposed extension})}{(\text{original floorspace area})} = \frac{76.72\text{m}^2 \times 100}{169.15\text{m}^2} = 45\%$$

This equates to a 45% increase over and above the original dwelling. Having regard to SPG7 which states that dwellings within the Green Belt can only be extended by up to

40% for the extension to be considered a proportionate addition, this increase would be a disproportionate addition and an inappropriate form of development in the Green Belt.

VSC

SPG7 states examples of Very Special Circumstances include where a building is similar in size to a building which could be built under Permitted Development.

It is considered that the proposed front porch would have a Permitted Development fallback position under S2, P1 Class D.1 (a) and (b) which permits a porch with a ground area of 3m² and 3m (H).

Though the proposed extension takes the cumulative effect above 40% of the original floor area, it is considered that the design is such that it enhances the appearance and character of the dwelling. The main roof of the dwelling and the proposed pitch roof design are unified and this design is considered to be an enhancement on the existing flat roof design of the existing single storey side extension which represents a disjointed arrangement.

These factors represent VSC's in terms of the potential impact on the openness of the Green Belt. It is therefore considered that within this context the extension would not be of any harm to the openness of the Green Belt.

To protect the openness of the Green Belt, permitted development rights under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (as amended) would be removed.

Design/Impact on street scene

The Residential Design Guide (SPG1) used to appraise the appearance and design of the proposal, is consistent with the design principles contained within the NPPF (section 7). Within both of these documents achieving good design is of fundamental importance.

Para 4.1 (d) of SPG 1 advises to keep the extension subordinate to the original house. Two-storey extensions should have a roof ridgeline set lower than the existing one in order to provide a design break between the old and the new and enable the extension to be visually subordinate to the original house.

SPG 1 advises that development forward of the building line need be given particularly careful consideration. In general extensions should be in scale with, and well related to, the original building and should not have a detrimental affect on the street scene or locality.

Set down: The proposed extension is two-storey in height but would be set down from maximum existing ridge height by approximately 0.9m (H).

Set off: The proposal would be off the boundary by approximately 8m (L).

Set back: The proposal would be set forward by approximately 1.6m (L).

I am of the opinion that the proposed set down and set off would be acceptable in appearance and design in relation to SPG1.

Though the proposed two storey side extension would not be set back from the original dwelling's principal elevation, it is considered that the proposal would be in scale with and well related to the original building and would not have a detrimental affect on the street scene or locality.

Therefore the proposal would be acceptable in terms of character, appearance and design in relation to SPG 1, Policy DS13 and S11 of the BDLP 2004 and the design principles contained within the NPPF (section 7).

Residential amenity issues

The Residential Design Guide (SPG1) used to appraise the impact upon residential amenity is consistent with the design principles contained within the NPPF (section 7).

Considering the guidance in SPG 1 and the design principles contained within the NPPF (section 7), as there are no neighbouring dwellings adjacent to the application site, the proposal would raise no residential amenity issues.

Landscape Protection Area

The site is within a Landscape Protection Area and although landscape protection is not explicitly included in the NPPF, Paragraph 17 (Core Principles) states that the intrinsic value and character of the countryside should be *recognized*.

Policy C1 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan identifies Landscape Protection Areas as local designations of areas where it is considered that the character of the countryside and the quality of the landscape merits special protection. It is noted that Policy C4 identifies specific criteria for assessing development proposals within Landscape Protection Areas by stating that any proposed development should not have a materially detrimental effect on the landscape.

Special attention is given to development on prominent slopes and the proposed site's location on a hillside, whilst providing panoramic views to the south-east, requires careful design that is sympathetic to the landscape. It is therefore necessary to ensure that all new development is sympathetic in form, scale and materials used.

Policy C1 and C4 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan is consistent with Paragraph 17 (Core Principles) of the NPPF.

It is therefore considered that the proposal would not cause significant undue harm to the amenities of the Landscape Protection Area.

Conclusion

Taking the above points into consideration and on balance I am of the view that planning permission should be granted.

RECOMMENDATION: that permission be **GRANTED**.

COO1 (development to commence within 3 years)

C001A (In accordance with approved plans)

C002 (matching materials)

C022 (removal of PD rights)

Notes

This decision has been taken having regard to the policies within the Worcestershire County Structure Plan (WCSP) June 2001 and the Bromsgrove District Local Plan 2004 (BDLP) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012 as summarised below:

WMSS: QE3

WCSP: CTC1, D38, D39.

BDLP: TR11, DS2, DS13, S11, C1, C4,

DCS2: CP3, CP22

Others: SPG1, SPG7, NPPF

It is the Council's view that the proposed development does not comply with the provisions of the development plan however very special circumstances exist that justify approving planning permission.