

Name of Applicant Type of Certificate	Proposal	Map/Plan Policy	Plan Ref. Expiry Date
Mr. B. Das 'A'	Erection of two storey extension to side of existing dwelling to include accommodation for elderly relative at 10 Uplands, Monument Lane, Rednal	GB	B/2008/0096 25.03.2008

RECOMMENDATION: that permission be **REFUSED**.

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

Consultations

WH	Consulted - views received 11.02.2008: • No objection.
ENG	Consulted - views received 27.02.2008: • No objection
PROW / RA	Consulted 01.02.2008 (expires 22.02.08): No observations received.
Alvechurch PC	Consulted - views received 12.02.2008: • Objection - The house has already been extended to a maximum 40%. The plans would be a massive increase, and be overbearing in a sensitive site on top of the hill adjacent to the Country Park.
Publicity	Three letters sent 06.02.2008, expire 27.02.2008. Site Notice posted 19.02.2008, expires 11.03.08. Press Notice published 07.02.2008, expires 28.02.2008.

The site and its surroundings

The application site relates to a detached dwelling located northeast of the highway and set back from the established building line. The site is within the Green Belt and surrounded by country parkland.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a two-storey side extension to adjoin an existing two-storey side extension to this detached dwellinghouse.

Relevant Policies

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

Relevant Planning History

B/2004/0355	Extension; permission refused 14.05.2004
B/2001/0512	Two storey side extension; permission granted 07.06.2001

Notes

The main issues to be considered are whether the proposal fulfils the requirements of policy S11 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan 2004, which states 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 development within the Green Belt. All works should respect the scale and character of the host dwelling and no material harm should be caused to the amenity of nearby occupiers.

SPG7 'Extensions to Dwellings in the Green Belt' states a maximum extension of up to **40%** of the original dwelling or a maximum total floor space of up to 140 sq. metres (that is, the original dwelling plus extension) may be regarded as a proportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling.

What is Original?

The original floor area is estimated at 151 sq. metres.

% increase? Is development appropriate?

A two-storey extension was approved under B/2001/0512, which had a floor area of approximately 64 sq. metres. The percentage increase of this extension represented 42% of the original floor space and the dwelling's extension allowance set within SPG7 has therefore been used. Permission for a further extension to the property under B/2004/0355 was subsequently refused at Planning Committee under SPG7 'Extensions to Dwellings in the Green Belt' as a disproportionate addition.

The proposed kitchen / utility extension and new entrance hall will provide 67.3 sq. metres and the 'Granny Flat' accommodation at first floor will provide 56 sq. metres. The total extension will provide 123.3 sq. metres of floor space, which will represent a floor area increase of 124% when added to the existing extension. An existing detached garage with a floor area of 49.5 sq. metres will be brought within 1.2 metres of the extended dwellinghouse and the total floor area increase over the original will therefore be 156.8%. The proposal will therefore clearly represent a disproportionate addition that is inappropriate development within the Green Belt.

Are there any Very Special Circumstances?

PPG2, paragraph 3.2 states that "Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt. *It is for the applicant to show why permission should be granted. Very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations*". The applicant has not provided any very special circumstances to justify the development.

The proposal only indicates that part of the extension will include accommodation for an elderly relative; however, I would remind Members that the provision of such facilities to dwellings within the Green Belt do not form a very special circumstance to override SPG7 or Green Belt policy and, in doing so, would set an undesirable precedent. The 'Granny

Flat' could in practice be occupied by anybody and I note that the accommodation is accessed by a stairwell, which would indicate that the intended occupant will not be infirm or have mobility problems. Although no supporting information has been provided by the applicant, I am nevertheless mindful that appeal history clearly indicates personal circumstances of the occupier will seldom outweigh the more general considerations. The proposal will be of a permanent nature and the extension will remain long after the personal circumstances of the applicant have ceased to be material.

I therefore consider that no very special circumstances exist or have been put forward to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt.

Design / Impact on streetscene

I am mindful that the original dwelling has already been extended and, although the proposed extension is set down and set back, its excessive bulk and mass will have a significant impact upon the proportions of the existing dwelling that will be clearly disproportionate, thus harming the original style and character of the host building.

Notwithstanding Green Belt policy issues, the proposed extension will have a limited impact upon the visual amenity of the streetscene, as the extension is set well back from the public highway on lower ground. Nevertheless, I am mindful that the most important attribute of the Green Belt is openness and in this context 'open' means undeveloped. The quality of the land or how well the development is screened from public view does not form a very special circumstance.

It should be noted that the extension will be easily visible from the public footpath running adjacent to the site.

Residential amenity issues

The proposed extension will be located a sufficient distance away from surrounding properties to avoid any significant impact upon the light or amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

RECOMMENDATION: that permission be **REFUSED**.

1. The proposed extension will exceed the 40% allowance as set in the Council's SPG7 'Extensions to Dwellings in the Green Belt' resulting in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building that will be harmful to its style and character. No very special circumstances exist or have been put forward to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. The proposal is therefore contrary to the Council's SPG7 'Extensions to Dwellings within the Green Belt', Bromsgrove District Local Plan 2004 policies DS2, DS13 and S11, Worcestershire County Structure Plan 2001 policies D.38 and D.39 and the aims and objectives of PPG2.