



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 December 2017

by B Bowker Mplan MRTPI

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

Decision date: 22nd December 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R1845/D/17/3181927

The Retreat, Lowe Lane, Wolverley, Kidderminster, Worcestershire DY11 5QP

- 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 Christopher Page against the decision of Wyre Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref 17/0398/FULL, dated 14 May 2017, was refused by notice dated 3 August 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as '*small extension to existing building to provide toilet- sink and storage*'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a small extension to existing building to provide toilet-sink and storage, at The Retreat, Lowe Lane, Wolverley, Kidderminster, Worcestershire DY11 5QP, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 17/0398/FULL, dated 14 May 2017, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan, Existing Floor Plan, Proposed Floor Plan, Existing North East and South West Elevations, Existing and Proposed North West and South East Elevations.
 - 3) The materials used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issues are:
 - Whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and any relevant development plan policies; and,
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

Whether inappropriate development

3. The appeal site comprises a single storey detached building used for holiday accommodation that is located within the West Midlands Green Belt. Policy SAL.UP1 of the Site Allocations and Policies Local Plan (SAP) and paragraph 89 of the Framework set out which categories of development are not classed as inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Of relevance, one category of development not considered inappropriate development relates to the extension of an existing building/dwelling, provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building/dwelling.
4. A single storey extension to the building was allowed at appeal¹ on 18 May 2016. In reaching the decision, the Inspector considered that the footprint of the extension would be modest (10.5sqm) and noted the proposal represented an approximate increase of 53% to the footprint of the appeal building. The extension allowed at the appeal in 2016 is yet to be constructed.
5. A more recent proposal for a single storey extension to the building was dismissed at appeal² on 19 April 2017. Based on the Council's measurements, the dismissed appeal involved an extension with a footprint of 9.3sqm. This extension would have been in addition to the extension allowed at the 2016 appeal. The Inspector in the 2017 case considered that the proposal was a disproportionate increase to the original building.
6. Based on the Council's measurements, the proposal before me would further extend the depth of the 2016 extension by 1.5m, giving an additional footprint of 5.55sqm. The Council calculate that the proposal would cumulatively increase the volume of the original building by approximately 73%.
7. The Council consider that a 70% increase in the size of the building would represent a disproportionate addition in the context of Policy SAL.UP1 and paragraph 89 of the Framework. However, based on the Council's calculations, the proposal would not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building, as set out by the Framework and Policy SAL.UP1. This was clearly the case in relation to the 2017 appeal which in conjunction with the approved extension would have increased the floor space of the original building by more than 100%.
8. Policy SAL.UP1 states that applications for extensions to existing dwellings will be considered on a case by case basis. In this case, taking into account the footprint and single storey scale of the proposal, the proposal in conjunction with the previously approved extension would not represent a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building.
9. The Council refer to the effect of the proposal on Green Belt openness. However, the exception at bullet point 3, paragraph 89 of the Framework does not require an assessment on this basis, with the impact on Green Belt openness implicitly taken into account in the exception. Consequently, although the Council contends that the scheme would have an effect on Green Belt's openness, as the development would not be a disproportionate extension or addition, it is not necessary that I separately assess its effect on openness.
10. Consequently, the proposal would not be inappropriate development having regard to the Framework and Policy SAL.UP1.

¹ APP/R1845/D/16/3148576, decision date 23 May 2016

² APP/R1845/D/17/3167747, decision date 11 May 2017

Character and Appearance

11. The Inspector determining the 2016 appeal concluded that the proposal before her would not harm the character and appearance of either the host building or surrounding area. The Inspector determining the 2017 appeal concluded that in conjunction with the previously approved extension, the proposal before him would visually dominate and overwhelm the original building.
12. The ridge height of the proposal before me would be in line with the previously approved extension and consequently below the ridge height of the original building. The height of the extension and its reduced and modest footprint would ensure the proposal, in conjunction with the approved extension, would be subservient to and not overwhelm the original building. In addition, a suitably worded condition would ensure that materials used in the construction of the external surfaces of the proposal would harmonise with those used in the existing building. In this context and taking into account the discrete siting of the extension to the rear of the building, the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
13. Therefore the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host building or surrounding area. Consequently the proposal would meet the requirements of SAP Policy SAL.UP8. Insofar as it relates this matter, this policy requires extensions to be subservient to and retain the visual dominance of the original building and harmonise with the existing landscape or townscape.

Conditions

14. The conditions set out above are based on those suggested by the Council. A condition specifying the relevant drawings is necessary in the interests of certainty. A condition relating to materials is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the area and host building.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, and having taken all matters raised into account, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the noted conditions.

B Bowker

INSPECTOR