

Name of Applicant	Proposal	Expiry Date	Plan Ref.
Mr Julian Lewis	Demolition of conservatory and erection of a two storey extension and porch Bridge House, Fish House Lane, Stoke Prior, Bromsgrove, Worcestershire B60 4JT	17.08.2017	17/00710/ FUL

RECOMMENDATION: That planning permission be **REFUSED**

Cllr Glass has requested that this application be considered by Planning Committee rather than be determined by Delegated powers, for the Applicant to have an opportunity to speak to outline why the scheme was acceptable.

Consultations

Stoke Parish Council Consulted 12.07.2017
No Comments Received To Date

Highways - Bromsgrove Consulted 12.07.2017
No Comments Received To Date

Worcestershire County Council Countryside Service Consulted 12.07.2017
No Comments Received To Date

Drainage Engineers Internal Planning Consultation Consulted 12.07.2017

The site falls within flood zones 2 & 3 (high risk of flooding) and is also shown to be susceptible to surface water flooding which has potential to be deep (over 300mm) and fast flowing (over 0.25m/s). We do hold reports of flooding in the vicinity.

While I acknowledge that the proposed extension is located over where a conservatory is currently located, it is still important to ensure that surface water for the development is appropriately managed and that no increase in flood risk is caused elsewhere.

The FRA mentions that water-butts will be utilised as a method of sustainable drainage; these are not considered to be appropriate drainage alone since they may not be emptied regularly enough or sized appropriately to capture sufficient water to ensure no increase in runoff from the site. They could however be used in conjunction with other drainage techniques - clay soils do not necessarily mean that SuDS are not possible, just that more bespoke solutions are needed. I presume the existing storm water system will be utilised and therefore have no major concerns regarding this.

I also would like to draw attention to the fact that while the FRA uses local data for the modelled flood depths, **the Climate Change allowances used relate to the Humber river basin district, not the Severn** - therefore the climate change limits included are lower than they should be (30-50% instead of 40-70%) and the on-site risk when climate change is included is going to be higher than is stated.

Since the application relates to an extension of an existing dwelling, raising floor levels of this alone will not alter the overall flood risk of the dwelling as a whole, and therefore following the EA's 2016 guidance on minor developments and extensions in flood zones 2 & 3, it would be appropriate to set floor levels no lower than existing levels, AND to flood proof the development to the 1:100 (1%) fluvial flooding level including an appropriate climate change allowance. This could include measures such as anti-flood air-bricks as well as resilience measures such as raised electricity sockets.

The FRA does mention these measures, however the Climate Change allowances included are not suitable, I would therefore like to suggest that should you be minded to grant permission, the FRA as it stands is not included as one of the approved documents, and that the following condition is attached to your decision notice:

Finished floor levels within the development shall be set no lower than existing levels AND flood proofing of the development has been incorporated to the 1:100 (1%) fluvial flooding level including an appropriate climate change allowance.

WRS - Contaminated Land Consulted 12.07.2017

No Comments Received To Date

4 Neighbours notified, -no responses received

Site notice posted 20.7.17 expires 10.8.17

Press notice Posted 17.7.17 expires 7.8.17

Relevant Policies

Bromsgrove District Plan

BDP1 Sustainable Development Principles

BDP4 Green Belt

BDP19 High Quality Design

BDP22 Climate Change

BDP23 Water Management

Others

NPPF National Planning Policy Framework

NPPG National Planning Practice Guidance

SPG1 Residential Design Guide

SPG 4 Conversion of Rural buildings

Relevant Planning History

B16508	Conversion of out buildings to dwelling	Approved	15.8.88
B/18328	Conversion of conservatory to lounge (amendment to Plan No. B16508).	Approved	09.10.1989

B/2005/0321	First floor link extension.		18.05.2005
16/0466	Demolition of rear conservatory and Erection of 2 storey extension	Refused	12.08.2016

Assessment of Proposal

Green Belt

Paragraph 89 of the National Planning Policy Framework explains that the construction of new buildings should be regarded as inappropriate development in the Green Belt, subject to a number of exceptions. One of these exceptions is the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building.

Original Converted stable building	126.68m ²
Previous Extension	112.31m ²
This Extension	64.85m ²
Total extensions of	177.16m ²
This equates to an increase of	139.84%

Historically the buildings comprised a single storey garage and a stable building.

As part of the 1988 conversion, new floor space was created above the garage, a glazed conservatory was formed linking the buildings and the first floor of the stable building was extended further to create an en-suite.

In 1989 permission was granted retrospectively for a brick infill replacing the conservatory with a lounge.

In 2005 permission was granted for a first floor infill above the lounge to provide a first continuous access along the first floor.

Members will note that despite the removal of permitted development rights as part of the original consent (reference B16508 condition 3), a conservatory and porch have also been added in the interim years. The LPA is satisfied that whilst these are unauthorised they were constructed more than four years ago and are therefore exempt from any enforcement action.

The proposal is to further enlarge the dwelling to the northern elevation, replacing the single storey conservatory and porch with a mainly two storey extension with a single storey element. This results in an increase of 177.16m² which would equate to an increase of 139.8% and represent a disproportionate addition.

Your adopted Policy BDP4 specifies that extensions that exceed 40% would be considered disproportionate. Disproportionate additions in the Green Belt represent inappropriate development and inappropriate development is by definition considered harmful to the openness of the Green Belt. The NPPF requires LPA's to attach substantial weight the potential harm to the Green Belt and to consider whether there are any very special circumstances that may outweigh the harm the proposal causes in this instance.

Very Special Circumstances

The applicant has provided justification for the works in terms of what they consider to be very special circumstances. The statement outlines that there will be:

- (1) Little or no harm to the openness or visual amenity as the property is in a secluded or little use location at over 30m away from any listed buildings and the neighbouring properties have written letters of support for the proposal.
- (2) The increase of the slab level for the extension will improve flood attenuation of the house as it replaces an existing conservatory.
- (3) There are other examples of the over large extensions and replacement dwelling granted in the District.

Harm to openness

In response, the Local Planning Authority do not consider there is no harm to openness or any impact to visual amenity in this instance. Whilst it is acknowledged that neighbouring properties have written in support of the works the works remain clearly disproportionate. The works will still clearly be seen.

It is acknowledged that the site is fairly isolated and this, in the LPA's opinion makes the extension more harmful to this location rather than as stated. If views are obscured this again does not overcome harm.

Sustainability

The new extension may be effectively flood resistant however this does not overcome the harm to openness by itself.

The Local Planning Authority are not contending that the extension is harmful to the setting of a listed building (located over 30m away) or in fact to other properties however lack of harm in these instances do not outweigh the harm of inappropriate development

The size the original conversion/extensions

The applicant maintains that there was a link between the original buildings, however, the existing floor plans submitted under the conversion application 1988 (ref B16508) simply show a brick wall link. The report of 1989 refers to 'a plain brick wall with a parapet'. Even if the LPA were minded to take a link into consideration when calculating the original floor space of the building, the remaining and proposed extensions would still equate to a floor area of 153.79m, an increase of 102.2%.

Design Appearance

When considering Policy BDP15 and BDP 19 of the adopted District Plan and the Council's SPG4 guidance on conversions it could be argued that the traditional form and distinctive character of the original stable building has already been compromised to a certain degree. The proposed extension would continue the linear form of the original building and would reflect the gable fronted design of the original garage element. It would result in a more sympathetic addition than the existing glazed conservatory which it would replace in terms of design and materials.

Whilst the proposed extension would not be visible from Fish House Lane it would be visible from the public bridleway, however, no objections have been received and it would not be considered harmful to the character of the area. Due to the buildings orientation and the mature screening surrounding the majority of the application site, the proposal would only be visible from the adjacent property Needle Mill Cottage.

It is not considered that the proposal would be clearly visible from or detract from the listed building which is located more than 30 metres away.

Amenity

The nearest property is adjacent and it Needle Mill Cottage. The orientation of Needle Mill Cottage, however, means that it faces towards the southern end of the building rather than the northern end where the proposal would be situated. Whilst there would be no overlooking or overshadowing, the proposal is most visible from the garden of Needle Mill Cottage.

Flooding

The dwelling is located within flood zones 2 and 3 due to its close proximity to the River Salwarpe. It is a national requirement within the NPPF that a flood risk assessment be undertaken, even for minor developments in flood zones 2 and 3, prior to determination. Given the previous application and association reason for refusal , the applicant has now submitted a full Flood Risk Assessment. The flood risk assessment provided contains modelling data which is based on the incorrect catchment however the North Worcestershire Water Management Team have indicated that subject to floor levels to address the correct data then conditions may be imposed to ensure the development complies with BDP 1 and 23 of the BDP.

Access and Parking

Members will note that Highways engineers did not raise any objections to the scheme previously (reference:16/0466) and access and parking arrangements remain unchanged therefore the scheme would be considered acceptable in terms of policy advice for access and parking

Other issues / approved applications

The applicant has provided examples of other approved extensions in the Green Belt. However members will appreciate that every application is based on its own merits.

13/0120 is for a replacement dwelling and is not comparable in this instance as other factors were considered in terms of outbuildings and cellarage areas which were considered in this assessment

16/0704 – Fish House Mill is a property with ‘Permitted Development Rights’ intact and 8m rear extension (while it is accepted is disproportionate) was constructed under the householder Prior Notification Scheme. PD rights are not applicable to this converted rural building as these rights have been removed.

17/0058 - Fish House Mill. This further permission was approved given the ability to again extend under standard Permitted development rights of Class A given the ability to provide a larger extension than the application as submitted so again Members will appreciate the ‘fallback’ position in this case.

Conclusion

In conclusion the proposal would represent a disproportionate addition and disproportionate additions represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt. In this instances the VSC outlined and the lack of harm to residential amenity clearly do not outweigh the significant harm to the openness of the Green Belt this extension proposal would cause in this case.

RECOMMENDATION: That planning permission be Refused

Reasons for Refusal

1. The extension represents a disproportionate addition in the Green Belt. Disproportionate additions represent ‘inappropriate development in the Green Belt’ and ‘inappropriate development’ is by definition fundamentally harmful to the openness of the Green Belt in this location.

Whilst there is no perceived harm to residential amenity and the circumstances of other approved extensions outlined by the applicant, these do not represent ‘very special circumstances’ that overcome the harm of the development or its inappropriateness and the harm to the openness of the Green Belt in this instance. The proposal is considered contrary to Policy BDP4 of the Bromsgrove District Plan 2011-20130 and the advice and guidance contained in the NPPF (Para 87-89).

Case Officer: Sarah Willetts Tel: 01527 881607
Email: Sarah.willetts@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk