

Name of Applicant	Proposal	Expiry Date	Plan Ref.
Mr Parmer	Rear extension and raising of roof to facilitate accommodation within the roof space  Three Oaks, Billesley Lane, Portway, Birmingham, Worcestershire B48 7HG	30.06.2016	16/0451

**Councillor Griffiths has requested that this application be considered by Planning Committee rather than being determined under delegated powers.**

**RECOMMENDATION:** That Planning permission be Refused.

### Consultations

**Beoley Parish Council** Consulted 11.05.2016  
No Comments Received To Date

**Worcester Regulatory Services- Contaminated Land** Consulted 11.05.2016  
No Comments Received To Date

**Publicity** 4 letters sent on the 11<sup>th</sup> May 2016 (expires 1<sup>st</sup> June 2016)  
Published on the weekly list sent 16<sup>th</sup> June 2016 (expires 6<sup>th</sup> June 2016)

One letter of support has been received, the contents of which are summarised as follows;

- 1) The proposed extension is discrete in that it is at the rear of the property so will not impact aesthetically on neighbouring properties.
- 2) The proposed extension is tasteful and is in keeping with other houses in the area, Billseley Lane has a mix of properties including both single and double storey dwellings.
- 3) The proposed extension will not impact on the neighbours view of surrounding green belt countryside.
- 4) The proposed extension is preferable to the previous approved extension in that the 8m kitchen extension and outbuilding would have impacted significantly on our view due to its proximity to the joint boundary

**Cllr Griffiths** believes that there are very special circumstances to allow this application.

### Relevant Policies

**Bromsgrove District Local Plan 2004 (BDLP):**  
DS2 Green Belt Development Criteria  
DS13 Sustainable Development

## S11 Extensions to Dwellings in the Green Belt

### **Others:**

SPG7 Extensions to dwellings in the Green Belt  
NPPF National Planning Policy Framework

### **Relevant Planning History**

14/0997	8m Rear Extension (Larger Home Extension)	Prior Approval Not required	05.02.2015
14/1024	Erection of building in garden to house home office and garden room	Approved	16.06.2015

### **Assessment of Proposal**

#### The site and its surroundings

The application site is located along Billesley road and the dwelling comprises a large bungalow with one bedroom at first floor level which fills the width of the plot.

The application site is situated within land designated as Green Belt as outlined on the Bromsgrove District Local Plan (BDLP) Proposals Map.

#### Background

The applicant has drawn the Councils attention to the planning history relating to the site, and in particular, application 14/0997 where prior approval was given for a single storey rear extension (under permitted development rights), and application 14/1024 where the Council have granted consent for a Certificate of Proposed Use or Development for an outbuilding. Neither of the above permissions has been implemented.

#### The Proposed Development

This application seeks planning permission for a part two storey, part single storey rear extension and raises the roof of the dwelling to accommodate addition accommodation within the roof space.

The principal issues for consideration in this case relate to the following:

- Whether the proposed development would represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt;
- Whether the proposed development will result in demonstrable harm to the openness of the Green Belt;
- Very Special Circumstances;
- Street Scene & Character Impact; and,
- Whether the proposed development will preserve the privacy and amenities of the occupants to neighbouring properties.

Whether the proposed development would represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt

Paragraph 87 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 89 states that a Local Planning Authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt, although an exception can include the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. Policy S11 of the Bromsgrove Local Plan (LP) supports national policy, and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Extensions to Dwellings in the Green Belt (SPG7) indicates that a maximum extension of 40% of the original dwelling, or a maximum of 140 sq metres floorspace may be considered proportionate.

The dwelling has been extended significantly in the past and therefore has extended beyond its proportionate allowance of 40% as identified in our SPG7. The bungalow was replaced by a larger bungalow in 1964 and subsequently extended twice in 1973 and 1996 with an extension on either side of the dwelling accumulating to a 129% increase over and above the foot print of the original dwelling.

The proposed extensions would include an increase in height of the dwelling by approximately 1.6 metres over a substantial area and a two storey rear extension. The proposed extension would result in an additional 188 square metres of floor space and an additional 101% increase above the original as illustrated in the graph below. Given the proposed addition to the existing floor area and the increase in height, the proposal would represent a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building. Therefore, the proposal would represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt, which is by definition, harmful to the Green Belt. The Framework advises that substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt. In addition, the extension would be contrary to the aims of Local Plan Policies DS2 and S11 and the Framework.

Floor space calculations.

Floorspace of original house or at 1/7/1948	186.00	sq. metres	
Extensions added prior to current application	240.00	sq. metres	129.03%
Current proposal	188.00	sq. metres	101.08%
Floorspace to be demolished	0.00	sq. metres	
Total Floorspace added	428.00	sq. metres	<b>230.11%</b>

### Whether the proposed development will result in demonstrable harm to the openness of the Green Belt

An assessment of the impact on openness is not confined to visual impact but is primarily concerned with physical presence. The proposal, by virtue of its increased scale, height and massing, would result in a significant reduction in the overall openness of the application site. Increasing the ridge height, in addition to a two storey rear extension would result in a significant extension to the property that would substantially increase its overall height and bulk. As such it would unacceptably erode the openness of the Green Belt, contrary to both the Framework and LP Policy

### Very Special Circumstances

The National Planning Policy Framework, in Paragraph 88, sets out that very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

As stated within the Supporting Planning Statement the applicant proposed that the trade-off of the recently approved prior notification for a single storey rear extension and an outbuilding permitted under Class E would present very special circumstances to outweigh the harm caused by this proposal.

The Council note that calculations have been supplied by the applicant in the planning statement, which suggests that the PD fall back would result in a reduction of the overall possible foot print of development on site 49.7sqm. This is noted, however, the Council consider proportionality based on external floor area. Therefore, the resultant additions to the dwelling is calculated to be 188 sqm and the outbuilding and prior notification extension combined result in 110sqm additional floor area. This would result in a 78 sqm increase in this proposal, along with the additional volume; the proposal is not considered a less harmful fall-back position.

The potential Permitted Development works have not been implemented and in any event would not be considered an equivalent fall-back for an increase to the roof height and a two storey extension. As such, little weight should be afforded to this argument in determining whether the proposed development would be inappropriate within the Green Belt.

The applicant has stated that they would be willing to enter into a section 106 Agreement with the Council to ensure that should permission be granted they would not erect the PD works. While, it is noted that the proposed extension is sited in the same location as the proposal, there would be the possibility of the outbuilding being erected. No legal agreement has been discussed with the Council, notwithstanding this no conditions or legal agreements could be considered to overcome the harm arisen by the proposed extensions.

### Street Scene & Character Impact

The shape and form of the extension would remain consistent with the prevailing street scene in the location and would be constructed of materials to match the host property which is considered acceptable.

### Neighbouring Privacy and Amenity

The proposed development would not result in any detrimental impact on the neighbouring properties with regard to loss of light, outlook or privacy.

### Conclusion

The proposal would be of advantage to the appellants by providing additional living accommodation for their extended family, however this would be a wholly private benefit to which very little weight can be attached. Similarly, although it is accepted that the extension has been designed to blend in with the host building, this would not provide any justification for inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

In view of the above, it is considered that the proposed development would be contrary to the advice of the National Planning Policy Framework and the provisions of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan in that the proposal amounts to inappropriate development in the Green Belt which is, by definition harmful. There would significant harm to the openness of the Green Belt at this location and this carries substantial weight. The matters raised by the applicant do not amount to very special circumstances required to justify the proposal.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Planning Permission be Refused.

### Reasons for Refusal

- 1) It is considered that the extension is inappropriate development in the Green Belt because the proposal would constitute a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling. The proposal for any further extension, would unacceptably harm the openness of the Green Belt, contrary to Policy DS2, and S11 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan, the provisions of SPG7 and the guidance contained in NPPF. No very special circumstances exist in this instance that would outweigh the harm that would be caused to the Green Belt.

**Case Officer:** Emily Farmer Tel: 01527 881657  
Email: Emily.farmer@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk