
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 January 2017

by David Murray BA (Hons) DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 27 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R0335/D/16/3161270

Homelea, Winkfield Lane, Winkfield, Windsor, SL4 4QU.

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs K Singer against the decision of Bracknell Forest Borough Council.
 - The application Ref. 16/00591/FUL, dated 13 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 2 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey garden room extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are whether the proposed extension would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt; and if so, whether there are very special circumstances which clearly outweigh this harm.

Reasons

Background

3. The appeal site contains a detached two storey house set in a large garden in a rural area outside any recognised settlement and which forms part of the Green Belt. It is proposed to add a modest single storey oak framed garden room extension to the side of the property.
4. The development plan for the area includes the Bracknell Forest Local Plan (2002) and the Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2008). These plans predate the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and I will consider the degree of consistency of each saved policy with the NPPF as it arises in the issue.

Whether inappropriate development

5. Policy GB1 of the Local Plan relates to the erection of new buildings in the Green Belt and indicates that permission will not be given, except in very special circumstances, for such work unless, amongst other aspects, it is for the 'replacement, alteration or limited extension of existing dwellings'. In addition, Policy CS9 of the Core Strategy reiterates the need to protect the Green Belt from 'inappropriate development'. These policies generally accord with the NPPF which indicates in paragraph 87 that 'inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and paragraph 89 sets out that the construction of
-

new buildings should be regarded as inappropriate unless one of the stated exceptions apply. The relevant one for this case is 'the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in inappropriate additions over and above the size of the original dwelling. This latter term is defined in the Glossary as the dwelling as it existed on the 1st July 1948 or, if later, as it was originally built.

6. In this case, on the face of it the proposed garden room appears as a minor addition to the property. However, the Council refers to the extensions that have been added to the property including in 2008 a large two storey extension with two rooms on the ground floor and three bedrooms above and I noted this extension at my site visit. The Council estimates that the cumulative increase in floor area from the original dwelling to be about 130%. Whereas the guideline figure set out in the reasoned justification to policy GB 1 is 40%. The proposal would add a further 12 sqm. floor area of building.
7. The proposal would add to the property already significantly enlarged and would be a disproportionate addition to the original building. I therefore find that the proposal would constitute 'inappropriate development' in the Green Belt.
8. I recognise that the property is well screened from the public highway and the garden room would be seen in the context of a large house and so would not be prominent, but the quality of openness of the Green Belt is not limited to public views, and the further enlarged property would detract from the general feeling of openness in this area.
9. I conclude on this issue that the proposed further addition of the garden room would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would harm its openness, contrary to the relevant provisions of the development plan and national policy

Whether outweighed by other factors

10. The appellant's agent highlights other dwellings and extensions that have been permitted in the vicinity of the site over the years and stresses the need for the house to evolve and grow to meet the appellant's family's needs. The quality of the oak framed structure is emphasised.
11. I noted the other houses around the site at my visit and it appeared to me that many of these had been extended. The Council advises that previously this part of Winkfield was regarded as a village in the Green Belt but this designation is no longer considered to accord with the NPPF which states that if the open character of a village contributes to the Green Belt then it should be included in the Green Belt. I therefore see the publication of the NPPF as a material change in circumstances as to how the extension of local properties in this area should be considered. I have also had regard to the needs of the family to use and enjoy their home but the property itself is already of a substantial size. Finally, I agree that the proposed garden room is proposed to be constructed in a quality materials but this quality does not overcome the basic issue of the further increase in the size of the property and whether disproportionate.
12. The NPPF indicates in paragraph 88 that significant weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt and I conclude that these other considerations do

not outweigh my findings under the main issue. Therefore 'very special circumstances do not apply.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Murray

INSPECTOR