

Name of Applicant	Proposal	Expiry Date	Plan Ref.
Mr and Mrs Ian and Anna Dunnaker	Alterations to existing detached garage building to create residential annex together with erection of a glazed link connecting the garage building and dwellinghouse and erection of a domestic store room.  Mossett Cottage, Third Road, Wildmoor, Bromsgrove, Worcestershire B61 0BT	02.06.2021	21/00556/FUL

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

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

### **Consultations**

#### **Belbroughton And Fairfield Parish Council**

The Parish Council Objects. While supporting the special circumstances listed concerns are raised that this would become a separate dwelling in the Green Belt on a property site that has already seen significant increase in size from the original footprint.

### **Publicity**

One site notice was placed onsite on 22<sup>nd</sup> April 2021 and expired 26<sup>th</sup> May 2021. 2 neighbour letters were set on 19<sup>th</sup> April 2021 and expired on 13<sup>th</sup> May 2021.

### Representations

2 letters of support have been received, 1 from the neighbour and 1 from Fairfield Village Community Association & Neighbourhood Watch Group. The contents of these comments have been summarised as follows;

- The alteration will allow independent living of elderly residents and the supportive care that they require.
- Alterations are not disproportionate
- In keeping with locality/unobtrusive
- Makes good use of garage

### **Cllr May**

On the grounds of public interest, I would like to call this application in if you are minded to refuse permission.

### **Relevant Policies**

#### **Bromsgrove District Plan**

BDP1 Sustainable Development Principles  
BDP4 Green Belt  
BDP19 High Quality Design

## Others

NPPF National Planning Policy Framework (2019)  
Bromsgrove High Quality Design SPD

### Relevant Planning History

B1992/0404	Erection of aluminium conservatory	Approved	12.06.1992
B/17405/1988	Two storey rear extension forming sitting room and bedroom.	Approved	22.12.1988
B/13242/1985	Garage with loft store.	Approved	30.09.1985
B/11166/1983	Erection of two storey extension. (as amended by plans received 22.09.1983)	Approved	22.09.1983

### Assessment of Proposal

This application is for alterations to the existing detached garage building onsite to create a residential annex together with the erection of a glazed link connecting the garage building and dwellinghouse and erection of a domestic store room to the rear. The annexe is proposed for the applicants elderly parents to occupy.

The application site is located within the Green Belt where there is a presumption against inappropriate development. Such development should not be granted planning permission unless there are very special circumstances. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) allows for the extension or alteration of a building within the Green Belt provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. Policy BDP4.4 of the adopted Bromsgrove District Plan permits extensions to existing residential dwellings up to a maximum of 40% increase of the original dwelling.

The existing dwelling has been extended on a number of occasions as outlined in the planning history above. The applicants outline in their Planning Statement that the dwelling has been previously extended by 116% above the original. This figure does not include the detached garage which was granted planning permission in 1985. Given this garage sits within 5 metres of the dwelling it should be considered an extension for the purposes of calculating a 40% addition. Including the garage, the dwelling has been extended 186% above the original. In any event, the existing dwelling has been extended well above 40% and as such any further additions to the building should be considered as inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The current proposal adds a further 12sqm in floor space which is a further 10% above the original. Although it is accepted this is a

modest increase, given the property is already disproportionate the harm would be exacerbated by the additional floor space.

The glazed link is small in scale and sited between the two buildings. In addition to this, the store to the rear is in the position to the existing external staircase. For these reasons, the proposal is considered to have a minimal impact on openness.

The applicants have put forward justification for this development on the grounds that the proposed accommodation is required for the occupation of the applicants' parents who are in need of care. The NPPF places a duty on Local Planning Authorities to provide housing needed for different groups in the community including families with children, older people and people with disabilities and therefore the requirement for this accommodation carries moderate weight. However, the garage could be converted without the glazed link and without the store to the rear. Although it is appreciated that the parents would need safe access to the main dwelling, the small distance from the building and level ground does not make the requirement for this link essential for the proposed use. This link is considered a preference not a necessity and does not prevent the garage being converted for the family's needs. The applicants have outlined in the Planning Statement that in isolation the store could be erected under Permitted Development. This is incorrect as planning permission would be required for the store given the garage is a previous extension and exceeds the dimensions of a Class E outbuilding. No further justification has been put forward for this store.

No concerns are raised on the design and impact on the street scene of this development, nor any issues are raised with amenity to adjoining occupiers by reason of overlooking, overbearing or loss of light.

The letters of support of this application outline that the extension is not disproportionate, is of good design and makes good use of the garage. Green Belt policy requires the extension be considered against the original rather than the existing situation and as such the extension is disproportionate as outlined above. No concerns are raised on the scheme on design, however good design is a requirement for all planning applications and does not constitute justification to allow for an inappropriate extension. It is agreed that the proposal makes good use of the garage however as outlined above, the additions are not required to ensure this conversion can take place.

An objection has been received from the Parish Council. The Parish raise concerns that the garage could form a separate planning unit. The proposal does not include a kitchen which indicates some reliance on the main dwelling as an annexe. Planning permission would be required to change the use to a separate dwelling. The Parish do however highlight in their comments that the dwelling has been significantly extended previously.

In conclusion, the proposed extensions amount to inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Although small in scale, taking into consideration the extensive planning history, the proposed extensions are to be considered disproportionate to the original dwelling. The applicants have advanced some justification for the extensions outlining it reasonable and necessary for the link to be provided to allow for safe access to the main dwelling. Given the short distance and level ground between the buildings, it is not agreed that this link is essential for the proposed use. For these reasons, it is not

considered the justification put forward amounts to very special circumstances sufficient to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by reason of the inappropriate development.

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

**Reasons for Refusal**

1. The proposed extension would constitute a disproportionate addition to the original dwelling. Disproportionate additions are by definition inappropriate development in the Green Belt. It is not considered that any very special circumstances exist that clearly outweigh the substantial weight given to the harm arising by reason of inappropriateness. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy BDP4.4 of the Bromsgrove District Plan and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

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