Mr Steven Grimes

Proposed Rear Extension, Internal Alterations & New Pitched Roof To Replace Flat Roof

Greenlands, Dagnell End Road, Redditch, Worcestershire, B98 9BJ

RECOMMENDATION: That planning permission be Granted

Consultations

Alvechurch Parish Council Consulted 07.11.2014
Objection: On Green Belt grounds - APC felt that this was inappropriate development. APC referred to the Decision notice as per planning application no: 14/0227 section (2) below.

'(2) The proposal represents an over-dominant feature that would not respect the scale and character of the existing building, contrary to Policy DS13 and Policy S11 of the Bromsgrove District Plan, the guidance set out in SPG1 and the provisions of the NPPF.’ It was also agreed as per section (3) that the proposal would exacerbate a loss of light to the neighbouring property.

Re-consulted 12.01.2015 – views awaited

Highways Department- Worcestershire County Council Consulted 04.11.2014

No objection to the grant of permission

Re-consulted 12.01.2015 – views awaited

Relevant Policies

Bromsgrove District Local Plan 2004 (BDLP):

S11 Extensions to Dwellings in the Green Belt
DS13 Sustainable Development

Bromsgrove District Plan Proposed Submission

BDP1 Sustainable Development Principles
BDP19 High Quality Design
BDP4 Green Belt

Others:

SPG1 Residential Design Guide
SPG7 Extensions to dwellings in the Green Belt
**Plan reference**

NPPF National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPG National Planning Practice Guidance

**Relevant Planning History**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14/0227</td>
<td>Proposed Pitched Roof To Replace Existing Flat Roof To Form Habitable Room &amp; Minor Internal Alterations</td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>01.07.2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1069</td>
<td>Extension to existing bungalow.</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>20.06.2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/1996/0278</td>
<td>Extensions to dwelling house</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>20.05.1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/7269/1980</td>
<td>Extensions and alterations to existing dwelling.</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>01.04.1980</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessment of Proposal**

The site and its surroundings:

Greenlands is a modern, detached bungalow situated on the north side of Dagnell End Road, Bordesley. The application property is within a row of dwellings, including single and two storey development of varying age and design. These properties are accessed to the front off a 'service road' which runs parallel with the main road. The application property is second from the end in the line of dwellings.

The site is located within an area designated as Green Belt as defined in the adopted Bromsgrove Local Plan.

Planning History:

This application is a revised scheme, following planning refusal 14/0227 dated 1 July 2014. The previous scheme comprised a first floor extension above the existing garage to the side of the property and internal alterations to the existing ground floor accommodation.

Application 14/0227 was refused on the grounds of inappropriate development within the Green Belt due to:

1. the height of the proposed extension,
2. design not being in-keeping with the character and appearance of the existing building and
3. significant impact on neighbouring amenity due to loss of light and outlook.

A previous application 12/1069 comprising single storey rear and first floor side extensions was also withdrawn in June 2013.
It is understood that previous extensions to the property have also been carried out as Permitted Development, including part of the existing flat-roofed side extension and a rear sun lounge.

Proposal:

The current application comprises a pitched roof above the existing flat-roofed garage to the side of the property, a single storey rear extension and re-configuration of part of the existing accommodation, including conversion of the garage into living accommodation.

The scheme has been amended during processing of this application, to reduce the scale of the proposal, including removal of a roof void above the side extension, amendment to roof design and deletion of a rear balcony.

Consultations/Publicity:

Adjoining neighbours at Merton House and Oaktree have been consulted on this application on 4.11.14 and re-consulted on 12.1.15. No formal objections have been received from either of these neighbours.

A site notice was displayed on 7.11.14 No comments have been received as a result of this.

Alvechurch Parish Council has been consulted on 4.11.14 and submitted objections to the proposal on 2 December 2014 on the grounds of:

1. Inappropriate development in the Green Belt
2. The proposal represents an over-dominant feature that would not respect the scale and character of the existing building, contrary to Policy DS13 and Policy S11 of the Bromsgrove District Plan, the guidance set out in SPG1 and the provisions of the NPPF.
3. Loss of light to the neighbouring property.

The Parish Council has been reconsulted on 12.1.15. No comments have been received in relation to the amended proposal.

County Highways Officer has been consulted on 4.11.14 and 12.1.15. Comments of no objection have been received.

Main Issues:

In respect of the development proposed, the main issues to consider are whether the proposal would overcome the previous reasons for refusal in relation to the 2014 application in terms of whether it would:

1. constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and if so whether any 'very special circumstances' exist to outweigh the harm caused to the openness and visual amenity of the Green Belt.
2. be acceptable in terms of design in relation to the character and appearance of the host dwelling
3. be detrimental to the surrounding locality in terms of its impact on the street scene and
4. have a significant impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

Green Belt:

The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts, with the essential characteristics of Green Belts being their openness and permanence. Paragraph 80 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 lists one of the five purposes of the Green Belt as "to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment." It is noted that the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness.

Paragraph 89 of the NPPF sets out one of the exceptions to inappropriate development in the Green Belt as being "the extension or alteration of a building provided it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building". This is reinforced by Policy S11 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan 2004 and Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 7 'Extensions to Dwellings Within the Green Belt' which guides that a maximum extension of up to 40% of the original dwelling may be viewed as a proportionate and acceptable addition.

In relation to additional floor space proposed by the current scheme, the following calculations have been carried out:

Table 1 - Proposed Increase in Externally Measured Habitable Floor Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approximate Externally Measured Habitable Floor Space:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original House</td>
<td>147.34m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed additional</td>
<td>114.8m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Proposed</td>
<td>262.14m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% increase over original</td>
<td>77.96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 above shows the proposed increase in externally measured floor space. With regards to the criteria of Policy S11, it is noted that in terms of scale, the proposed extension represents a 114.8 square metre addition, which represents a 77.96% increase over the original habitable floor space and is therefore deemed to represent inappropriate development.

It is now for me to consider whether any Very Special Circumstances exist that would outweigh any harm to the openness of the Green Belt by virtue of the inappropriateness of the development. In this instance, it is considered that there are two Very Special Circumstances which should be taken into account:

1. A significant part of the proposed rear extension would fall within the Permitted Development limitations for single storey rear extensions, which would enable a 4 metre depth rear extension to the property up to 4 metres in height, without the need for planning permission. In this case, 43.3 square metres of the proposed extension would fall within the scope of Permitted Development, with only 71.5 square metres of the proposed development technically requiring planning permission. Therefore, if the above figures were re-calculated, taking into account what could be carried out under Permitted Development limitations, the proportionate increase would be reduced.
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Development, the percentage increase in habitable floor area would be a lower figure of 48.5% increase as opposed to 77.96%. In effect, the part of the scheme which would not be Permitted Development would only be 8.5% above what would normally be considered as proportionate in Green Belt terms.

2. The application property is also located within a ribbon of residential development (ie. Within a substantial line of dwellings with residential properties adjacent on either side). In this circumstance, the relationship of the property to the type, scale and character of the adjoining development will be taken into account in evaluating the harm caused to the openness of the Green Belt.

The proposed extension is single storey in height and to the rear of the bungalow and the other part of the scheme involves adding a pitched roof to the existing flat roof, but of a subordinate height to the existing roof. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed scheme would not have a significant visual impact on the openness of the Green Belt in this locality and this would therefore amount to a Very Special Circumstance.

Furthermore, in terms of the additional guidance given in SPG7, The addition of a pitched roof to the existing flat-roofed side garage element of the building would help to unify previous extensions, and would represent 'planning gain' therefore this is also considered to counterbalance the fact that the extension is disproportionate in Green Belt terms.

Design, Character and Appearance:

It is considered that the appearance and scale of the proposed extension and roof alterations would be in-keeping with the character of the host dwelling. Roofs would be pitched, fenestration would be similar to the host dwelling and materials are proposed to match the existing bungalow. The pitched roof above the existing garage would be of a lower height than the existing main roof of the property and so would represent a subordinate addition which would visually improve the character and appearance of the existing property. It is therefore considered that the proposed extensions and alterations would be acceptable and would conform with current planning guidance in the Council's SPG1 Residential Design Guide.

Street Scene Aspects:

It is also important that the design and materials do not appear incongruous within the street scene. The agent for the scheme has provided Street Scene and Perspective Views as part of the planning application, which it is considered, fully demonstrate that the proposed alterations would be in-keeping with the general area and the group of dwellings of which this property forms a part. Furthermore, from the front, the property is well set back from the road in comparison to nearby properties and is quite hidden from view due to the dense vegetation to the front boundary. The rear extension proposed would not be visible in the street scene. The main feature which would be viewable would be the new pitched roof above the garage which is considered would enhance the street scene due to improvements in design and appearance.

Residential Amenity:

SPG1, Residential Design Guide, provides guidelines with regards to criteria that should be met in order to ensure acceptable implications of designs in terms of residential
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amenity. It is noted that no objections have been received to the revised scheme from either of the neighbouring properties’ occupiers.

The proposed rear extension is set away from both adjacent dwellings. It would be 12 metres away from Oaktree at its nearest point and 15 metres away from Merton House. The only new window proposed to the flank wall is a small window to serve a proposed WC, which would not give rise to any overlooking towards either of the neighbouring properties, due to the single storey nature of the proposal, and the position of this window in relation to existing boundary screening.

In relation to potential overbearing or overshadowing impact for the rear extension, there is a strong hedge and tree boundary between the application property and Oaktree which would largely screen the extension from view. Whilst the proposed extension would technically breach the 45 Degree Code as set out in SPG1 in terms of daylight and sunlight in relation to Oaktree, it is considered that due to the position of the proposed extension being to the north east of this property, the boundary screening which is approximately 2 metres in height, the single storey height of the proposed extension and the fact that this element of the scheme would qualify as Permitted Development not requiring planning permission in this part of the building, that the single storey element would not have a significant impact on adjacent amenities.

In terms of overshadowing/overbearing impact for the proposed roof alteration, the proposal would comprise an increase to the height of the existing garage flank wall to add a gable roof on the boundary with Merton House, so there would be some additional impact on amenity for occupiers of that property. Objections to the previous scheme were received from the occupiers of Merton House, however, no objections have been received in respect of this application. After carrying out a detailed inspection on site from the neighbouring property, although it is considered that there would be some additional impact on amenity in relation to the current scheme, this is significantly less than for the previous scheme and given that the proposed addition of this roof is similar to what could be done as Permitted Development (the proposed height is 4.4 metres and an extension of 4 metres height could be constructed in the same position without the need for planning permission), it is considered that the additional minimal height increase would be acceptable in terms of additional impact on amenity.

It is therefore considered that nearby neighbouring residential properties are not significantly impacted in terms of overlooking, privacy or overbearing.

Conclusion:

Having regard to the previous planning history on this site, Policy S11, DS2, DS13 of the Bromsgrove Local Plan and SPG1, SPG7, NPPF and NPPG considerations, the current application is considered to be of an acceptable scale and character, reflective of the scale and character of the host dwelling in accordance with current Local and National Policy guidance.

Taking the above points into account, it is considered that planning permission should be approved in this instance. However, given the scale of the proposed development and its Green Belt location, it is recommended that Permitted Development Rights should be
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removed for Classes A, B and C, to enable the LPA to retain control over future potential extensions and roof alterations at the property.

**RECOMMENDATION:** That planning permission be Granted

**Conditions:/Reasons for Refusal**

1) The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

   Reason: Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the Approved Plans/ Drawings listed in this notice:

   Site Location Plan at Scale 1:1000 Received 6.1.15
   Block Plan at Scale 1:1000 Received 6.1.15
   Existing and Proposed Floor and Roof Plans Plan No. SJD-004-P-005B at Scale 1:100 Received 6.1.15
   Existing and Proposed Elevations Plan No. SJD-004-P-006C at Scale 1:100 Received 6.1.15
   Existing and Proposed Front Street Scenes and Perspective Views Plan No. SJD-004-P-007B Received 6.1.15

   Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3) All new external walls and roofs shall be finished in materials to match in colour, form and texture those on the existing building.

   Reason: To protect the visual amenity of the area in accordance with policy DS13 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan January 2004

4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order) no development included within Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes A, B and C shall be carried out without the prior approval of the local planning authority to an application in that behalf.

   Reason: To protect the openness of the Green Belt in accordance with policy DS2 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan January 2004

**Case Officer:** Jane Fray Tel: 01527 881 693
Email: jane.fray@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk