
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 June 2017

by R C Shrimplin MA(Cantab) DipArch RIBA FRTPI FCI Arb MCIL

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

Decision date: 10 July 2017

Appeal Reference: APP/T3725/D/17/3174301

'Hampton View', Henley Road, Hampton-on-the-Hill, Warwick CV35 8QX

- 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 Mr N Purser against the decision of Warwick District Council.
 - The application (reference W/16/2291, dated 15 December 2016) was refused by notice dated 1 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is described in the application form as a "single storey building with flat, green (living) roof linking the two existing residential buildings that comprise the property, Hampton View".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a "single storey building with flat, green (living) roof linking the two existing residential buildings that comprise the property, Hampton View" at 'Hampton View', Henley Road, Hampton-on-the-Hill, Warwick CV35 8QX, in accordance with the terms of the application (reference W/16/2291, dated 15 December 2016), subject to the following conditions.

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings:

drawing number AVD-HRH-PL01 (Proposed Plans and Elevations);

drawing number AVD-HRH-PL02 (Location Plan).

Main issues

2. The first main issue to be determined in this appeal is whether the proposal is "inappropriate development" in terms of Green Belt policies. If so, it is necessary to consider whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm would be clearly outweighed by other considerations; if not, it is nonetheless necessary to consider the impact of the proposed development on the surroundings.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is an isolated property in the countryside and Henley Road, on which the site is located, is a busy route, linking Warwick with Henley-on-Arden (as the A4189). The site at 'Hampton View' lies adjacent to the main road,

- with a long road frontage and a narrow plot shape. It is bounded by mature hedges and is reasonably well screened, with open fields both to the north (across the road) and to the south.
4. The house that stands on the plot is two-storey building, rendered with a slate roof and originating, apparently, as a "farm cottage". To the east a separate single storey building has been erected, of brickwork with a slate roof, providing further residential accommodation. This building is the subject of a "Lawful Development Certificate of Existing Use of Development", dated 7 December 2016 (under reference W/16/1941), which confirms the lawfulness of the "existing outbuilding to the rear of Hampton View used as an annexe". The buildings are set in attractive gardens.
 5. It is now proposed that a single storey link building should be constructed, to link the outbuilding to the original dwelling.
 6. The 'National Planning Policy Framework' makes it plain, at paragraph 89, that the construction of new buildings is not normally acceptable in the Green Belt and that they should only be permitted in "very special circumstances". Nevertheless, the extension of an existing building in the Green Belt can be acceptable "provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building".
 7. This approach is reflected in the Development Plan and Policy RAP2 of the adopted 'Warwick District Local Plan 1996-2011' (which deals with "Extensions to Dwellings") opposes "disproportionate additions to the original dwelling", in respect of dwellings within and outside the Green Belt. Policy H14 of the emerging 'Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2026' similarly opposes "disproportionate additions to the original dwelling" for "Extensions to Dwellings in the Open Countryside".
 8. More generally, planning policies are also intended to encourage good design.
 9. The proposed extension would provide a link between two existing buildings that are currently in lawful residential use but, in itself, it would provide only limited space (including a "store/plant" room). This new link building would be constructed with a flat roof, incorporating a glazed lantern, planted as a "living green roof". Although the materials proposed (as shown on the submitted drawing) would not match those of the existing buildings, the link building would be in harmony with them.
 10. The newer single storey building has significantly increased the volume of buildings on the site but the proposed link building would be small in itself and would not significantly increase the volume of the existing house. It would respect the character of the original house and it would not significantly increase the impact of the site on the character or openness of the Green Belt.
 11. In this particular case, therefore, I have concluded that the proposed rear link extension would not amount to a "disproportionate" addition to the dwelling and, hence, that it would not amount to "inappropriate development" in terms of Green Belt policies.
 12. It is nonetheless necessary to consider the impact of the proposed development on the surroundings. Both national and local planning policies

emphasise the aim of achieving good design standards in the broadest sense, including maintaining the overall quality of the area and providing good standards of accommodation. In this case, the proposed link building would be in harmony with the host building and would markedly improve the usefulness of the existing accommodation in the two existing buildings. In itself, the proposed link building would have no significant impact on the wider surroundings.

13. The site lies within the Green Belt, where development is strictly controlled to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Green Belt policies are long established and well understood and they impose a presumption against "inappropriate development" unless there are "very special circumstances" which justify it in a particular case. Nevertheless, for the reasons given, I am persuaded that the scheme before me can properly be permitted, subject to conditions, and, although I have considered all the matters that have been raised in the representations, I have found nothing to cause me to alter my decision.
14. I have, however, also imposed conditions, in the usual way, to define the planning permission.

Roger C Shrimplin

INSPECTOR