

Name of Applicant	Proposal	Expiry Date	Plan Ref.
Mr Geoff Ellis	Extension to garage Poultry Farm Cottage, Agmore Lane, Tardebigge, Bromsgrove, Worcestershire B60 1PS	10.08.2017	17/00728/ FUL

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

RECOMMENDATION: That planning permission be Refused

Consultations

Tutnall and Cobley Parish Council Consulted 29.06.2017
No Comments Received To Date

Publicity

1 neighbour notified 29.06.2017, expires 20.07.2017: No response received.

1 site notice was posted 05.07.2017, expires 26.07.2017 : No response received.

Councillor Deeming – Would like members to consider the planning merits.

Relevant Policies

Bromsgrove District Plan

BDP1 Sustainable Development Principles
BDP4 Green Belt
BDP19 High Quality Design

Others

NPPF National Planning Policy Framework

Relevant Planning History

B/2005/0670	Single storey rear extension	Allowed on Appeal	13.10.2005
B/2001/0025	Extension to dwelling.	Approved	02.03.2001
B/2000/1049	Extension to dwelling and detached garage. Change of use of land from agricultural to domestic for repositioned drive access.	Approved	27.11.2000

Assessment of Proposal

Poultry Farm Cottage is one of a pair of semi-detached dwellings located off Agmore Lane in a remote position. The planning history shows extensions to the dwelling in excess of 40%, including a rear extension allowed on appeal, and a separate detached garage.

The main issues are whether or not the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt; the effect of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt and, if the development is inappropriate, whether the harm, by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm, would be clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development. In addition to this, whether its design would be in keeping with the character of the rural building and whether the proposal would be detrimental to the visual amenities and character of the area.

The site is in the Green Belt. The National Planning Policy Framework is a material consideration and states that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. Paragraph 89 of the Framework says that the construction of new buildings should be regarded as inappropriate in the Green Belt.

Policy BDP4 of the adopted local plan seeks to protect the character of the Green Belt and states that the development of new buildings in the Green Belt is considered to be inappropriate except in certain circumstances. BDP4.4 point c) permits extensions up to 40% of the original dwelling. There is no allowance in respect of outbuildings although replacement buildings within the curtilage can be considered acceptable if they are not materially larger than that existing. In this case the existing building is a double garage with a pitched roof, 6.3 metres by 6.1 metres and a height of 2.7 metres to eaves and 5.2 metres to the ridge.

The proposed garage as extended is of significant size of 8.6 metres by 6.3 metres, 2.7 metres high to eaves and an overall ridge height of 5.7 metres, with an additional floor within the roof space. Therefore the garage would be materially larger both in terms of footprint and scale and is, by definition, inappropriate development in the Green Belt, thus harming the openness of the Green Belt and contrary to the NPPF, Policy BDP4 of the BDLP.

The applicant has put forward that, 'this is for a games room for my grandchildren, who I collect from school every day, they don't have the room at home to enjoy indoors games activities'. However this argument could be repeated elsewhere and I do not consider that these comprise the very special circumstances required to overcome the harm to the Green Belt.

It is concluded that the development is inappropriate and by definition harmful. Its bulk and additional height above the existing structure add to this harm and reduce openness so undermining one of the key purposes of Green Belt designation. It is considered that there are no very special circumstances to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. In addition this is well in excess of the 4 metre height that could in other circumstances be allowable under permitted development for single storey curtilage buildings. In this case it

is a two storey building and therefore no realistic permitted development fall-back position would apply.

No very special circumstances exist that would outweigh the harm that would be caused to the Green Belt. The proposal would therefore be contrary to BDP4, and BDP19 of the Bromsgrove District Plan and the guidance contained in Paragraph 89 of the NPPF.

RECOMMENDATION: That planning permission be Refused.

Reasons for Refusal

- 1) The proposed development is inappropriate and by definition harmful. Its bulk and additional height above the existing structure add to this harm and reduce openness so undermining one of the key purposes of Green Belt designation. There are no very special circumstances to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. The proposal would therefore be contrary to BDP4 and BDP19 of the Bromsgrove District Plan and the guidance contained in Paragraph 89 of the NPPF.

Case Officer: Sally Price Tel: 01527 881683
Email: sally.price@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk