

Name of Applicant	Proposal	Expiry Date	Plan Ref.
Mr & Mrs T Jennings	Two-storey side extension and pitched roof over existing garage  342 Alcester Road, Burcot, Bromsgrove, Worcestershire, B60 1BH	17.07.2017	17/00550/FUL

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

**RECOMMENDATION:** That planning permission be **Refused**

### **Consultations**

*No consultation required*

### **Public notifications**

One site notice was posted 16.06.2017 and expired 07.07.2017: No response received.

Two neighbour letters sent 15.06.2017 and expired 06.07.2017; No response received.

### **Relevant Policies**

#### **Bromsgrove District Plan**

BDP1 Sustainable Development Principles

BDP4 Green Belt

BDP19 High Quality Design

#### **Others**

NPPF National Planning Policy Framework

NPPG National Planning Practice Guidance

SPG1 Residential Design Guide

### **Relevant Planning History**

17/0144	Demolition of a single storey detached garage and workshop, attached toilet extension and attached conservatory and replacement with a two storey kitchen and bathroom extension, single storey garage and conservatory.	Withdrawn	11.05.2017
---------	--	-----------	------------

BU/237/1969	Garage.	Granted	18.06.1969
Proposed garage.		Granted	13.04.1960
Proposed house.		Granted	09.07.1952

### **Assessment of Proposal**

The application site is located within the defined village envelope of Burcot, which is an area designated as Green Belt. Burcot Village Hall is situated to the west side of the site, and there are residential properties to the east and opposite the site.

The host dwelling was constructed around the early 1950's and historical records show that the porch, the conservatory, and the garage are later additions.

The current proposal is for a two storey side extension, which would attach to the existing detached garage and store room. Part of the existing garage building would be demolished as part of the scheme. The proposal would also include the addition of a pitched roof over the garage and the replacement of the raised patio to the rear.

Given that the property lies within the Green Belt the main issues to consider with this application are whether the proposal would constitute inappropriate development within the Green Belt, and whether it would have any adverse impact on the openness of the Green Belt. Further to this the impact of the proposal on the character of the dwelling and the local area, and the impact on residential amenity will need to be considered.

### **Green Belt**

There is a presumption against development within the Green Belt; however paragraph 89 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) lists a number of exceptions that may not be inappropriate within the Green Belt, which include a proportionate addition to an original building. Policy BDP4.4c of the Bromsgrove District Plan states that an extension of up to a 40% increase of the original dwelling may be appropriate provided it has no adverse impact on the openness of the Green Belt. The NPPF defines an **original building** to be a building as it was originally constructed or as it existed on the 1st July 1948; whichever is later. In this case the building as originally constructed comprised floor space totalling 132.16 sqm.

Additions to the original building would include the existing conservatory and porch extensions, which are modest in scale, and the proposed additions of the two storey extension and the retained part of the non-original garage. Calculations for previous and proposed extensions are shown in the table below.

	<b>Sq metres</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Floor space of the original dwelling</b>	132.16	
<b>Previous extensions</b>		
Conservatory	12.96	9.8%
Porch	3.30	2.5%

Retained part of garage (not including demolished part)	25.97	19.65%
<b>Proposed extensions</b>		
Two storey extension	(3.7x5.9x2) 43.66	= 33.04%
Minus original toilet to be demolished in place for extension	-6.84	-5.2%
<b>Total additional floor space above that of original</b>	79.05	<b>59.81%</b>

The proposal, accounting for the partial demolition of the existing garage, would result in additional floor space totalling 79.05 square metres above that of the original or a 59.8% increase. Given that this would exceed the 40% tolerance set out in Policy BDP4.4c and given that the additions would have a moderate impact on openness by visibly filling the open space on the west side of the dwelling, the proposal would be considered inappropriate development within the Green Belt.

In accordance with the NPPF inappropriate development is harmful by definition and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Any harm to the Green Belt is assigned substantial weight. A number of considerations summarised below have been put forward by the applicant, however it is felt that these would not amount to a very special circumstance that would clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt.

<b>Summary of consideration put forward</b>	<b>Officer's assessment</b>
There was an original garage built with the house, which has since been demolished. This should be included within the original floor space calculations.	As the building no longer exists today, the floor space cannot be counted within the calculations. Notwithstanding this there is insufficient evidence to prove its existence or understand its size.
The application site is located within a built up area of ribbon development.	The assessment of whether an extension is proportionate and therefore appropriate development within the Green Belt, does not take into account whether the building is within a ribbon of development.
There would not be any visual harm arising from the proposed development.	Lack of visual harm would not outweigh the definitional harm arising through the development being inappropriate.
Subservience of the extension to the original property.	Policy BDP4.4c defines proportionate to be a maximum of 40% increase in floor space above the original, and not whether the design appears subservient.
Limited impact of previous extensions	Previous extensions, even if modest, would contribute towards to 40% tolerance set out in Policy BDP4.4c.
Location within a village where new infill development is acceptable	Infill development is a different exception within the NPPF and Development plan, and is therefore irrelevant to the determination of this application.

Compatibility with Green Belt purposes	Although the development does not conflict with Green belt purposes, it would still amount to inappropriate development, which must be given substantial weight.
Scope to extend the property under permitted development	The permitted development 'fall back' position would not be equivalent to the proposal in terms of location, and no information has been put forward to suggest that building this alternative would be a likely prospect.
Improved design of the dwelling	The limited design improvements would not outweigh the substantial harm arising through inappropriate development within the Green Belt.

### Design

In design terms, the two storey side extension would be of a substantial width and would include a half-hipped roof design, which would not entirely match the more simple hipped design of the main roof. Although both the width of the extension and the proposed roof design would result in a relatively wide looking structure, the two storey extension would be well set back from the front of the dwelling and overall would appear subordinate, meeting the guidance contained in the Council's SPG 'Residential Design Guide'. The replacement of the existing flat roof of the garage with a pitched roof would have some design benefit by harmonising its appearance with the main dwelling. Overall the design merits of the scheme would lead to an enhancement of the character of the local area and would fulfil the requirements of Policy BDP19.

### Amenity

Having regard to policy BDP1.4e of the Bromsgrove District Plan, which seeks to protect residential amenity, it is noted that the proposed development would be located on the west side of the application site, where the boundary is shared with the local village hall. Notwithstanding this the two storey element of the proposal would be positioned a minimum of 1.7 metres from the common boundary, and addition of the roof to the garage would only create a single storey development of a relatively modest height. Given the relationship of the proposed balcony and the raised patio area to the adjacent village hall building, there would not be a loss of privacy as a result of the proposal.

### Conclusion

The limited enhancement to the appearance of the dwelling, and the lack of harm arising to neighbouring amenity would not outweigh the substantial weight that is assigned to harm to the Green Belt through inappropriateness and loss of openness. The other considerations put forward as part of this application would not amount to a very special circumstance that would outweigh harm arising to the Green Belt.

**RECOMMENDATION:** That planning permission be **Refused**

### Reasons for Refusal

- 1) The site is identified as an area falling within the Green Belt where there is a presumption against inappropriate development. The proposed extensions, in

addition to previous extensions, would result in disproportionate additions and would therefore amount to inappropriate development within the Green Belt, which is, by definition harmful. The proposal would also have a moderate impact on the openness of the Green Belt. Considerations put forward would not amount to a very special circumstance that would outweigh the harm that would be caused to the Green Belt. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy BDP4 of the Bromsgrove District Plan (2011-2030) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Case Officer:** Charlotte Wood Tel: 01527 64252 Ext 3412  
Email: [Charlotte.Wood@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk](mailto:Charlotte.Wood@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk)