

| Name of Applicant<br>Type of Certificate | Proposal  | Map/Plan<br>Policy | Plan Ref.<br>Expiry Date         |
|--|---|--------------------|----------------------------------|
| <b>MR. &amp; MRS.<br/>QUINN<br/>'A'</b>  | Two-storey side extension - Harwood House,<br>Wassell Grove, Hagley | GB<br>LPA          | <b>B/2007/1021</b><br>25.12.2007 |

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

#### Consultations

|           |   |
|-----------|---|
| Hagley PC | Consulted 26.09.2007: No objection received 15.10.2007, but comment that the extension would be very large.   |
| WCC(HP)   | Consulted 27.09.2007: No objection received 02.10.2007.   |
| Publicity | Four neighbour notification letters sent 27.09.2007(expired 18.10.2007).<br>Site notice posted 02.10.2007 (expired 23.10.2007).<br>Press notice published 04.10.2007 (expired 25.10.2007): No responses received. |

#### The site and its surroundings

This application relates to a substantial, detached dwelling set in grounds of some 13,210 square metres, located on the north-east side of Wassell Grove Road, Hagley. The site is located within the Green Belt, Land Protection Area and Area of Great Landscape Value allocations within the BDLP 2004.

#### Proposal

The applicants propose to development a two-storey extension on the south-west side of the dwelling to provide a breakfast area, large entrance hall, cloakroom and porch on the ground floor, with two further bedrooms with en-suite above and balcony on the rear. The extension would be 14.45 metres x 5.85 metres on the ground floor and 13.55 metres x 5.85 metres at first floor with a maximum height of 8.2 metres to the highest point of the double hipped roof.

#### Relevant Policies

|        |                        |
|--------|------------------------|
| WMSS   | QE3                    |
| WCSP   | CTC.1, D.38, D.39      |
| BDLP   | DS2, DS13, S11, TR11   |
| Others | SPG1, SPG7, PPS1, PPG2 |

#### Relevant Planning History

|             |   |
|-------------|---|
| B/1999/1015 | Rear sun lounge with balcony over; approved 20.12.1999 (implemented). |
| B13296      | Extensions to house; approved 15.10.1985 (unimplemented).             |
| B9110       | Extensions to house; approved 08.08.1981 (part-implemented).          |
| B7579       | Extensions to house; approved 2.06.1980 (part-implemented).           |
| B6566       | Extensions to house; approved 21.09.1979.                             |

(It should be noted that due to the fact that two of the above applications have been part implemented, they are still live permissions and could be completed should this application be refused. However, the floor area of the live permissions would be less than that proposed for this application).

### Notes

The main issues are whether the proposal represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt and, if so, whether any very special circumstances exist to warrant setting aside the presumption against such a scheme.

### **Green Belt Policy**

The main issue to consider is whether the proposal fulfils the requirements set out in policy S11 of the BDLP which highlights that extensions should not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling. Any extension(s) must be proportionate to the size of the original dwelling; otherwise it is inappropriate within the Green Belt. All works should respect the scale and character of the existing dwelling and no material harm should be caused to the amenity of nearby occupiers.

A maximum extension of 40% of the original dwelling, or a maximum total floor space of 140m<sup>2</sup> (that is, 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 unless a case for Very Special Circumstances has been demonstrated.

I can confirm that the original floor space was approximately 291.2m<sup>2</sup>. Previous additions have added a further 164.23m<sup>2</sup> and this proposal would add 163.2m<sup>2</sup>. This results in a total accumulative percentage increase of 112.7% which does not conform to the criteria for Extensions to Dwellings in the Green Belt which is highlighted in SPG7 with no Very Special Circumstances being demonstrated.

### **Design**

SPG1 advises that extensions should remain subordinate to the main dwelling house and suggests that extensions should be set down, set back and set off from the side boundary.

**Set down:-** The proposed two-storey side extension would be set down from the existing roofline.

**Set off:-** The proposed two-storey side extension would be set off the boundary with the neighbouring property by more than 1 metre.

**Set back:-** The extension would be set back at first floor level by 1.1 metres.

There would also be a balcony to the rear of the first floor element of the proposal. The proposed balcony is an extension to an existing first floor balcony at the rear of the property. This, along with the fact that there is dense screening along the boundary with the neighbouring property (Wassell Grove House), results in this not having a detrimental affect on their privacy.

I am satisfied that the proposed two-storey extension would fulfil the requirements which are set out in SPG1 of the Councils Residential Design Guide and, as such, I consider this aspect to be acceptable.

### **Impact on amenity**

There would be sufficient distance between the proposed side extension and the neighbouring property to ensure that the proposed extension would not have a detrimental impact on them with regard to loss of light, outlook or privacy and is, therefore, in accordance with guidance within SPG1. In addition to which, the boundary is dominated by dense vegetation in the form of mature trees and shrubs.

### **Impact on the LPA**

Policy C4 of the BDLP states that development would not be permitted where it would have a materially detrimental effect on the landscape, in particular within Landscape Protection Areas. Special attention should be given to areas with prominent slopes, woodland / hedgerows or water features, none of which would be affected by the proposal as per the reasons stated above.

### **Conclusions**

The proposed extension would be contrary to guidance set out in SPG7 and, as such, considered to be a disproportionate addition and therefore harmful to the openness of the Green Belt.

The proposed extension would be acceptable in all other considerations as described above.

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

1. The proposed extension would represent a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling and therefore constitutes an inappropriate form of development in this location, with regard to the scale, height and design of the proposal. The proposed extension would harm the openness and the character of the Green Belt and would thus be contrary to the aims of policy D.39 of the WCSP, policies DS2, DS13 and S11 of the BDLP, SPG1, SPG7 and the provisions of PPG2 Green Belts.