

Name of Applicant	Proposal	Expiry Date	Plan Ref.
Mr Nick Stockdale	First floor rear extension. 12 Dordale Road, Bournheath, Bromsgrove, Worcestershire, B61 9JS	24.09.2018	18/00963/FUL

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

RECOMMENDATION: That planning permission be **Refused**

Consultations

Belbroughton And Fairfield Parish Council Consulted 16.08.2018

The Parish Council has no objection provided the cumulative increase in size is within the 40% guidelines.

Worcestershire Wildlife Trust Received 03.09.2018

Given that repair works have recently been carried out you can progress the application without further information

Publicity

Four letters were sent to the adjoining occupiers on 16th August and expired on 9th September 2018.

One letter of support was received in respect of this application. The comments within this letter were not considered to be material planning considerations.

M. A. Sherrey Received 03.09.2018

The first floor infill would look more in place than the tired looking flat roof in the green belt, in fact it would enhance the green belt.

Relevant Policies

Bromsgrove District Plan

BDP1 Sustainable Development Principles

BDP4 Green Belt

BDP19 High Quality Design

BDP21 Natural Environment

Others

NPPF National Planning Policy Framework (2018)

SPG1 Residential Design Guide

Relevant Planning History

16/0241	First floor rear extension	Withdrawn	25.05.2016
---------	----------------------------	-----------	------------

B/9346/1981

Erection of first floor extension

Granted

30.11.1981

Assessment of Proposal

The application site is located within the Green Belt. Policy BDP4 of the Bromsgrove District Plan sets out that the development of new buildings in the Green Belt is considered inappropriate, except in specific circumstances. The circumstances are broadly consistent with those set out in the National Planning Policy Framework which in paragraphs 145 and 146 sets out the categories of development which may be regarded as not inappropriate, subject to certain conditions. The application development falls under the category of an extension of a building, or specifically in relation to policy BDP4, to an existing residential dwelling. In considering whether or not it would be inappropriate development, a determination has to be made as to whether or not it would result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building.

In this respect, Policy BDP4 interprets disproportionate additions as being extensions that would represent more than a maximum 40% increase of the original dwelling or more than a maximum total floor space of 140 square metres. The proposed extension when combined with previous additions to the original dwelling equates to 69% which exceeds 40% threshold.

The applicant contends that the proposal is small in scale and would only extend above an existing flat roof part of the dwelling to the rear. Whilst that would be the case, the key factor concerning harm due to inappropriateness for the purposes of the Framework is proportionality and size rather than visual impact. Importantly in this respect, cumulatively with those other existing extensions, the proposal would further add to the already significantly extended dwelling, which, under the current development plan policy would be considered disproportionate.

Whilst the proposed extension itself would only represent a small percentage increase in size of the current dwelling, this is not a factor which carries any weight in the context of the significant cumulative additions to the original property. Having regard to this, the proposal must be regarded as inappropriate development in the Green Belt of which is provided substantial weight and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

An assessment of the impact on openness is not confined to visual impact but is primarily concerned with physical presence. Although the proposed extension would be located within the existing built form, it is considered the extension would introduce some additional bulk, particularly to the roof space. On this occasion, it is considered the development would affect openness to some extent by occupying space. Therefore the proposal would cause limited harm to the openness of the Green Belt.

It has been put forward that the extension would improve the design of the dwelling, removing the existing flat roof section. The single storey flat roof element is unobtrusive to the overall design of the dwelling and the proposed pitch on the first floor element removes the symmetry achieved on the existing rear extension. Although no concerns are raised in respect of the design of the scheme, the design is not such an improvement

to the dwelling to justify otherwise inappropriate development in the Green Belt. I would consider the design of the extension to be a neutral matter in the planning assessment.

Having regard to the above, although little weight is afforded to harm through loss of openness to the Green Belt, this does not remove the harm that would be caused to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness to which substantial weight should be given. Furthermore, no special circumstances exist or have been put forward that would justify the development.

The proposed extension proposes a side window which faces onto the neighbouring dwelling No. 14 Dordale Road. It is noted that there is an existing window on this elevation however the proposed window will be closer to the boundary. No. 14 has no windows on this side facing elevation and a lean to garage that extends to the boundary. The property has a greater depth and therefore the window would not cause an issue of overlooking into this dwelling or onto the rear private amenity space of this dwelling. The application would not raise any concerns in respect of the amenity of the neighbouring properties. The application is not considered to give rise to any other planning issues and no objections have been received from the consultees.

The applicant has submitted information in respect of protected species. No further information is required in this respect. Members will note Worcestershire Wildlife Trust have not raised any objections to the scheme.

RECOMMENDATION: That planning permission be **Refused**

Reason for Refusal

- 1) The proposed extension would constitute a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling which is considered to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt by definition and substantial weight should be afforded to this harm. The development would affect openness to some extent by occupying space. Therefore the proposal would cause limited harm to the openness of the Green Belt. No very special circumstances exist which would outweigh the harm that would be caused to the Green Belt. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to BDP4 of the Bromsgrove District Plan 2011-2030 and section 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

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