



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2025 by E Street BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P1805/D/25/3372022

124 Bromsgrove Road, Romsley, Worcestershire B62 0LA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Graham Yapp against the decision of Bromsgrove District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00364/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as a “1st Floor Build over the existing GF side extension to the existing property”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure & Preliminary Matter

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal. The description of development on the application form differs to the decision notice. I am however satisfied that it accurately describes the proposal so the main parties would not be prejudiced by me using it.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are a) whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt; b) its effect on the openness of the Green Belt and c) if the scheme would be inappropriate development, whether any harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, would be clearly outweighed by other considerations, as to amount to the very special circumstances required to justify it

Reasons for the Recommendation

Inappropriate Development

4. Policy BDP4 of the Bromsgrove District Plan (LP) 2017 is broadly consistent with the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) insofar that the development of new buildings is considered to be inappropriate, except in certain circumstances. In this instance BDP4 sets out, amongst other things, that extensions to existing residential dwellings are allowed up to a maximum of 40% increase of the original dwelling or increases up to a maximum total floor space of 140 square metres. Paragraph 154 (c) of the Framework explains that the extension or alteration of a building in the Green Belt might not be inappropriate development, provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. For the purposes of the Framework and

BDP4, the original building is as it existed on 1 July 1948 or if constructed after this date, as it was built originally.

5. It is unclear as to whether the building predates 1948 but it appears it has been extended more than once, via single storey, to each side. Some plans provided by the Council show an approval in 1980 for what is the pitched roof side extension. The use of a flat roof and a contrasting (what appears to be) metric sized brickwork on the opposite side single storey extension suggests it is equally modern. Indeed, it is not shown on the 1980 plans. The appellant explains that a garage block was demolished and replaced with a bedroom on the same footprint but does not say when/where this was or whether said garage was original. In any case, there is no ground floor bedroom. With this and lack of any compelling evidence to the contrary in mind, it would appear the central two storey section of the existing dwelling is the original.
6. BDP4 is inconclusive as to whether the 40% uplift permitted is in relation to floorspace albeit this is how the Council has interpreted it. The appellant has not provided a counter argument and whilst it is sufficiently clear that the 140 square metre allowance is concerned with floorspace, there is nothing compelling to suggest I should not follow the same assessment as the Council. BDP4 does not say explicitly that anything greater than either of the two increases would be disproportionate but is taken to be in the absence of anything saying it wouldn't and the limitations of the Framework on the same.
7. The Council refers to floor area, but this is taken to be floorspace given the figures it has provided and reference to the additional which is a first floor. Having regard also to the language used in BDP4. The total floorspace of the previous extensions plus the proposed in the appeal scheme would be substantial, amounting to just over that of the original again. Policy allows for less than half. In addition, the extended element would be a new first floor, with accompanying roofspace, which would amount to a sizeable extension in volume terms, greatly increasing the presence of the resulting building.
8. With the quantitative increase in mind, the proposed works would breach the allowances in BDP4 by more than double. They would therefore be inappropriate development in the eyes thereof and thus conflict therewith. Taking this into account as well as the qualitative increase of the size of the building alongside the other previous extensions, the appeal scheme would represent disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original. As such, the scheme would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt for the purposes of the Framework. This would be harmful by definition.

Openness

9. Openness is an essential characteristic of the Green Belt. Such has a visual and spatial aspect. The latter can be taken to mean the absence of built form. The proposal would not increase the land take that the overall dwelling has. It would, however, increase the height significantly as it is to the side elevation. This would be highly noticeable from the front. It would take up physical space that was previously open and undeveloped. There would thus be an unavoidable reducing effect in both aspects of the Green Belt's openness. This would conflict with the purposes of the Green Belt, in its openness and permanence, as sought to be protected and referred to by Policy BDP4 and the Framework.

Other Considerations

10. The Council has not identified any other harms arising from the proposal; however, this would be a neutral matter in any balancing exercise. The appellant has raised other recent development within the local vicinity. However, I have limited information regarding these examples besides photographs, and I am unaware of the prevailing policies or circumstances of their planning approval. Therefore, I can only give limited weight to them. It is not sufficiently clear that the proposed development is the only way of meeting the increased internal space requirements of the incumbent family. I therefore attach limited weight to this personal need.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. The proposal would result in inappropriate development within the Green Belt. It would also reduce the Green Belt's openness. These harms are worthy of substantial weight as per the direction of the Framework. For the reasons I have explained, the other considerations would not be sufficient to clearly outweigh the harms I have found. Such that the very special circumstances necessary to justify the proposal do not exist.
12. For the reasons given above the appeal scheme would not comply with the development plan and I have been given no compelling reason, taking into account other material considerations advanced (including the approach of the Framework), to deviate therefrom. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR