



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 December 2019 by G Sibley MPLAN MRTPI

**Decision by J Whitfield BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 10 January 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/R0335/D/19/3235250**

**Pucks Blarney, Crouch Lane, Winkfield, Windsor SL4 4TL**

- 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 Douglas Jeatt against the decision of Bracknell Forest Council.
  - The application Ref: 19/00474/FUL, dated 8 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 July 2019.
  - The development proposed is described on the application form as 'porch addition, replace infill courtyard with doors and make alterations internally, Juliet balcony to rear and raise roof to provide additional bedroom.'
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

### Procedural Matters

3. Planning permission has already been granted for a single storey side/rear extension, front porch and external alterations under application reference: 18/00908/FUL. The main difference between the approved scheme and that before me would be the increase in roof height and the front and rear dormer windows.

### Main Issues

4. These are: 1) Whether or not the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt; 2) the effect on the openness of the Green Belt; and 3) if the proposal amounts to inappropriate development, would the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, be clearly outweighed by other considerations. If so, would this amount to the very special circumstances required to justify the proposal.

### Reasons for the Recommendation

#### *Inappropriate development*

5. The National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) states that inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be permitted except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 145 indicates that

the construction of new buildings should be regarded as inappropriate in the Green Belt subject to a number of exceptions.

6. The proposed development is for an extension to an existing building. Consequently, it would fall to be considered under sub-section (c) of paragraph 145 of the Framework which states that an extension or alteration to a building would not be inappropriate development provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. Policy GB1 of the Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan (2002) (BFBLP) is a similarly worded Green Belt exceptions policy and is therefore consistent with the Framework. Policy GB1 notes that the Council would normally consider any increase to be disproportionate if it exceeds 40% of the gross floor area of the original dwellinghouse.
7. The Council indicate that, because the BFBLP was adopted prior to the Framework, it has adopted the Framework definition for 'original dwellinghouse' as set out in Annex 2. The Framework refers to the building as it existed on 1 July 1948 or, if constructed after 1 July 1948, as it was built originally.
8. The Council has identified that the gross floorspace for the original dwellinghouse was around 74.9sqm. The appellant has not contested this figure and I have no reason therefore to believe that is not the case.
9. The dwelling has been extended a number of times and based on the officers report the gross floor area for the dwelling is currently around 225.59sqm. That is an approximate 205% increase in floorspace from the original dwellinghouse. The proposed extension would increase the floorspace to around 255.55sqm which would equate to an approximate 241% increase in gross floorspace. The appellant does not dispute those figures and I have therefore no reason to conclude otherwise.
10. Therefore, considering the percentage increase, the proposed development would, combined with the already built extensions, amount to a disproportionate addition to the original dwellinghouse. Paragraph 145 is a closed list and the proposal would not fall within the other sub-sections. Consequently, the scheme would not fall within any of the exceptions set out in paragraph 145 of The Framework.
11. I conclude, therefore, that the proposal would amount to inappropriate development in the Green Belt. I afford substantial weight to the harm that would arise to the Green Belt in accordance with paragraph 144 of the Framework. Accordingly, the development would conflict with BFBLP Policy GB1 which states that extension to dwellings within the Green Belt should not be disproportionate to the host dwelling.

### *Openness*

12. The dwelling is situated within ribbon development along Crouch Lane that is characterised by grassed verges and low buildings which contributes to the open character of the area which positively contributes to the openness of the Green Belt. The host dwelling is a part single storey and part two storey building and the proposal would raise the height of the roof above the single storey element to create a complete two storey building. The proposal would therefore increase the height of the building and because the proposed dwelling would be taller than the surrounding dwellings in the immediate street scene

the proposal would have a greater effect on the visual aspect of the Green Belt as it would be more visible from further afield. Therefore, the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the visual aspect of the Green Belt.

13. The proposed development would extend out from the rear of the proposal and whilst this would not be visible it would result in the development of undeveloped land within the Green Belt. The proposal would also develop upwards where there is currently no built form and as such the proposal would have a harmful effect on the spatial aspect of the Green Belt.
14. I conclude, therefore, that the development would have a harmful effect on the openness of the Green Belt, in that it would be reduced. Such harm is to be afforded substantial weight in accordance with paragraph 144 of the Framework. Consequently, the development would conflict with Policy GB1 of the BFBLP which notes the need to ensure the visual and physical impact of the extension is acceptable.

#### *Other considerations*

15. The appellant notes that there is a need for the extension to provide accommodation for their daughter to remain living at home. However, the development would be permanent and would be retained in perpetuity in the event personal circumstances of the appellant were to change.
16. The appellant notes that the proposal would be more in 'harmony' with many of the properties in the street scene that have been subject to development. However, the lack of harm in respect of the effect of the character and appearance of the development on the character of the area would fall neutrally within the balance.

#### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

17. The proposed development would cause harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and harm to openness. I give this substantial weight. The proposed development would be contrary to policy BG1 of the BFBLP and policy CS9 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document.
18. On the other side the proposal would provide additional accommodation for the appellants family and would create an attractive dwelling. To these factors I apply limited weight in favour of the proposed scheme.
19. The advanced considerations in support of the appeal, do not, on balance clearly outweigh the conflict with planning policies designed to protect the Green Belt. The very special circumstances necessary to justify the development do not exist.
20. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

*G Sibley*

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

#### **Inspector's Decision**

21. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I too agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Jason Whitfield*

INSPECTOR