



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 August 2020 by Darren Ellis MPlan

Decision by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N3020/D/20/3255194

127 Moor Road, Papplewick, NG15 8EN

- 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 Helen Guyler against the decision of Gedling Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/0179, dated 19 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear and two storey side extension.
-

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.

Main Issues

3. The appeal site is within the Green Belt and so the main issues are:
 - whether the proposal would be inappropriate development for the purposes of development plan policy and the National Planning Policy Framework;
 - the effect of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt; and
 - if the proposal would be inappropriate development, whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify it.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Whether the proposal would be inappropriate development

4. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) establishes that new buildings in the Green Belt are inappropriate except in certain circumstances, including where they involve the extension of an existing building. This is provided that the extension does not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building. The Framework defines 'original building' as 'a building as it existed on 1 July 1948, or, if constructed after 1
-

July 1948, as it was built originally.’ It does not however define ‘disproportionate’.

5. Policy 3 of the Aligned Core Strategies Part 1 Local Plan (adopted September 2014) (ACS) and Policy LPD13 of the Local Planning Document Part 2 Local Plan (adopted July 2018) (LP) are consistent with the Framework in that they seek to protect the Green Belt. Policy LPD13 allows extensions to existing residential dwellings in the Green Belt, up to a maximum of 50% increase of the floorspace of the original dwelling provided that this scale of development has no adverse impact on the openness of the Green Belt.
6. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling with an existing two-storey, flat-roof side extension and rear conservatory. The proposed development would see the conservatory replaced with a single-storey rear extension, and the two-storey side extension would be enlarged to infill the area to the front of the existing extension, along with the additions of a hipped roof and a small single-storey element to the front elevation.
7. The Council asserts that the existing extensions have increased the floorspace of the original property by 59.22%, and that this increase in floorspace would raise that to be 99.35%, including the proposed development. The appellant does not contest these figures and I have no reason to disagree.
8. The proposed enlargement to the floorspace from the original dwelling would therefore exceed the 50% limit set out in Policy LDP13 of the LP. In addition, the Framework requires that development does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the *size* of the original building. Size is more than a function of floorspace and includes bulk, mass, and height. As a result of the proposal, the bulk and massing of the property would be increased particularly at the side and at roof level, in addition to the increase to its original floorspace. Accordingly, based on the evidence before me, the proposed extension would amount to a disproportionate increase above the size of the original building in the context of the Framework and would conflict with Policy LDP13 of the LP and Policy 3 ACS.
9. The proposal would therefore be inappropriate development which is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt.

Openness

10. Openness is an essential characteristic of the Green Belt. The Planning Practice Guidance states that openness is capable of having both spatial and visible aspects, so that both the visual impact of the proposal and its volume may be relevant.¹ The appeal site backs on to open countryside and the rear of the property is visible from a public footpath that runs to the south of the site.
11. The proposed rear extension would be of a similar size to the existing conservatory while the proposed side extension would fill in a small area to the front of the existing side extension, with the single-storey element of this extension projecting slightly forwards of the existing front elevation of the original property. Consequently, the visual bulk of the building would be increased by the extension and, although the increase would be modest, the proposal would result in a limited reduction in the openness of the Green Belt. Given the modest scale of the extension, this would cause limited harm to the

¹ Planning Practice Guidance, Paragraph: 001 Reference ID: 64-001-20190722

openness of the Green Belt and is in addition to the harm by reason of its inappropriateness.

Other Considerations

12. I understand the appellant's desire to provide additional space to the family home, and to enable the space currently used as the conservatory to be able to be used all year round. I also acknowledge that the proposed side extension with the hipped roof would be a visual improvement over the existing flat roofed extension. Overall, I attach moderate weight to these matters.
13. My attention has been drawn to previous extensions at nearby properties. No details have been submitted of these extensions or when they obtained planning approval. I am therefore unable to determine whether these neighbouring extensions meet the 50% limit of Policy LPD13 of the LP, if they were approved since the adoption of the LP, or whether they met the requirements of the local and national policies if they were approved prior to the LP, the ACS or the Framework. For these reasons I am cannot be certain that these nearby extensions are directly comparable to the proposal before me. Accordingly, these extensions carry limited weight in favour of the proposal.

Planning balance and Conclusion

14. The development causes harm to the Green Belt by way of its inappropriateness and to its openness, and the Framework establishes that substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt.
15. The Framework states that development should not be approved unless the harm to the Green Belt, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. Although weight is attached to the other considerations that are raised by the appellant as set out above, even considered cumulatively they do not clearly outweigh the totality of the harm I have identified. Consequently, the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development do not exist.
16. Therefore, for the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

D Ellis

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

17. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

S Ashworth

INSPECTOR