

**Planning Committee:** 28 February 2017

**Item Number: 7**

**Application No:** [W 16 / 1511](#)

**Registration Date:** 28/10/16

**Town/Parish Council:** Beausale, Haseley, Honiley & Wroxall **Expiry Date:** 23/12/16

**Case Officer:** Holika Bungre  
01926 456541 Holika.Passi@warwickdc.gov.uk

**Elmhurst, Honiley Road, Beausale, Warwick, CV35 7NU**

Erection of 2no. single storey side extensions, two storey rear extension and external alterations FOR Mr Bird

-----

This application is being presented to Committee due to support from the Parish Council having been received.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Planning Committee are recommended to refuse this planning application for the reasons set out at the end of this report.

**DETAILS OF THE DEVELOPMENT**

The proposals is for the erection of 2 no. single storey side extensions (one to each side of the house) which are set back from the main front elevation, and a two storey rear extension which attaches to them both, forming a wrap around extension. Alterations are also proposed to the chimney and porch design.

**THE SITE AND ITS LOCATION**

The application site relates to a two storey detached dwellinghouse located on the west side of Honiley Road, close to its junction with Butlers End in Beausale. The site has open countryside to the rear and is washed over by Green Belt. The property appears to have a post 1948 single storey rear extension and a post 1948 porch, neither of which have any associated planning history. These have been counted as extensions to the original dwelling.

**PLANNING HISTORY**

None relevant to the determination of this application.

**RELEVANT POLICIES**

- National Planning Policy Framework

The Current Local Plan

- DP1 - Layout and Design (Warwick District Local Plan 1996 - 2011)
- DP2 - Amenity (Warwick District Local Plan 1996 - 2011)

- DP3 - Natural and Historic Environment and Landscape (Warwick District Local Plan 1996 - 2011)
- DP13 - Renewable Energy Developments (Warwick District Local Plan 1996 - 2011)
- RAP2 - Extensions to Dwellings (Warwick District Local Plan 1996 - 2011)

#### The Emerging Local Plan

- BE1 - Layout and Design (Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029 - Publication Draft April 2014)
- BE3 - Amenity (Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029 - Publication Draft April 2014)
- DS19 - Green Belt (Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029 - Publication Draft April 2014)
- DP3 - Natural and Historic Environment and Landscape (Warwick District Local Plan 1996 - 2011)
- NE3 - Biodiversity (Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029 - Publication Draft April 2014)

#### Guidance Documents

- Residential Design Guide (Supplementary Planning Guidance - April 2008)
- Sustainable Buildings (Supplementary Planning Document - December 2008)
- The 45 Degree Guideline (Supplementary Planning Guidance)
- Vehicle Parking Standards (Supplementary Planning Document)

### **SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS**

**Beausale, Haseley, Honiley & Wroxall Parish Council:** Support application for the following reasons:

- The removal of the workshop and garage would reduce the proposed floor area, to below the recommended percentage increase;
- The proposed application would enable the parking of the residents cars to be on site, and therefore off the highway. This section of Honiley Road is used for parking by residents of Heath Terrace. It is quite a dangerous section of road, and Elmhurst is close to the bend;
- The application will improve the facilities for a modest house to suit family needs, and is in keeping with the surroundings;
- The proposed alterations would be sympathetic to the environment, with the roof line matching those of adjacent properties in Heath Terrace;
- Similar extensions had been previously agreed for other properties in the adjacent Heath Terrace.

**Cllr Sue Gallagher:** Supports application.

**WCC Ecology:** Believe that there are more bats than that which the submitted Bat Survey found, however, agreed proposed mitigation measures within the report will have scope to suitably mitigate against the bats they believe may be on site, and therefore require further activity surveys to be secured by condition,

where mitigation measures would also be conditioned to be carried out in full. Further requested notes concerning birds, reptiles and amphibians.

**Public Response:** 2 letters of support received on the following grounds:-

- The designs are sensitive and in-keeping with the village and character of Beausale's rural community.
- The additions will enhance the living conditions of the current property.

## **KEY ISSUES**

### **Assessment**

The main issues in the consideration of this application are:

- Whether the proposal is appropriate development in the Green Belt and, if not, whether there are any very special circumstances which outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm identified.
- Design, scale and impact on the street scene
- Impact on neighbour amenity
- Renewables
- Ecology
- Parking and highway safety

Whether the proposal is appropriate development in the Green Belt and, if not, whether there are any very special circumstances which outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm identified

The NPPF sets out exceptions to inappropriate development in the Green Belt, which includes the limited extensions of buildings which do not result in a disproportionate addition to the original building. Saved Policy RAP2 goes on to clarify that extensions of more than 30% of the gross floor space of the original dwelling are likely to be considered disproportionate in the Green Belt.

The total original floor space of the application property is calculated to be 108m<sup>2</sup>. Existing extensions amount to 6.89m<sup>2</sup> which equate to 6.38%. The proposed extensions amount to 43.06m<sup>2</sup> at ground floor and 24.9m<sup>2</sup> at first floor. The existing and proposed extensions taken together would total 74.85m<sup>2</sup>, which equates to a 69.3% increase in floor space over and above the original dwelling, which is well over twice what would be considered to be proportionate in accordance with saved Policy RAP2. The proposal is therefore inappropriate development in the Green Belt which is harmful by definition and by reason of harm to openness and is contrary to both Policy RAP2 and the NPPF.

The Parish Council's support for the proposal on the basis that the removal of the workshop and garage would reduce the proposed floor area to below the recommended percentage increase is noted. However, in accordance with the NPPF and Policy RAP2 other outbuildings cannot be taken into account in determining the floor area of the original building. Whilst it is noted that the removal of the garage and workshop would result in one is mindful that new outbuildings could also be erected under permitted development.

Even if the removal of the outbuildings is factored in, the proposal will still result in an increase in floor area of 40.63% over and above the existing, whereby the proposal remains inappropriate development in the Green Belt harmful by definition and by reason of harm to openness.

A separate bat loft is also required to mitigate against the impact to protected species which will result in further harm to the openness of the Green Belt. The applicant has put forward a permitted development fall back position which they feel could be implemented on site. However, in line with the approach that Inspectors have taken at appeal in recent cases, permitted development is not considered to be a fall back position which justifies the approval of planning permission for development which is otherwise considered to be inappropriate in the Green Belt.

The other factors cited by the Parish Council in support for the proposal have also been taken into account but are not considered to constitute very special circumstances which outweigh the harm identified.

#### Design, Scale and Impact on the Street Scene

The comments in support with reference to the design are noted. Due to the subservient single storey extensions which are also set back from the front elevation (the only aspects directly visible from the public highway), the original design of the cottage is still apparent when viewed from the street. Alterations proposed to the chimney and porch designs are considered acceptable and overall the design is not considered to comply with Policy DP1 and the Residential Design Guide SPG.

#### Impact on Neighbour Amenity

The extensions are at a considerable distance from the adjacent property and the 45 degree line is not breached. As such, it is considered that there will be no material harm to living conditions by reason of harm to light or outlook.

The proposed first floor window to the north elevation is a smaller version of an existing window which is proposed to continue to serve a bathroom. The window provide screened views to the public highway and the front garden of the adjacent neighbour which is visible in the street scene and therefore there will be material loss of privacy as a result of the proposal.

The proposed first floor French doors with Juliet balcony to the south side elevation provide views onto open fields and will not result in overlooking to neighbours. The first floor French doors and Juliet balconies to the rear will look directly onto the applicant's own garden and will not result overlooking to the adjacent neighbour. Overall therefore, the proposals are considered not to harm the amenity of the neighbours.

#### Renewables

Given the scale of the proposed development it is considered that a requirement to provide 10% renewables/ fabric first approach in accordance with Policy DP13 and the associated SPD would be appropriate.

It is stated that a fabric first approach is proposed to be used for construction, together with an air source heat pump with under floor heating at ground floor level and a log burning stove to comply with this requirement. Details can be secured by a pre-commencement condition.

### Ecology

WCC Ecology had requested a bat survey which was provided by the applicants. They concluded that further activity surveys would be needed to clarify the type and number of bats which may be present, and to then confirm suitable mitigation measures, although they felt that the bat loft suggested as mitigation in the bat report would be likely to be sufficient. If located over 2m from any boundary, the suggested bat loft has the scope to be permitted development. Overall concerning bats, they considered that a condition for further activity surveys and the implementation of mitigation measure should be added to any approval granted.

### Parking and Highway Safety

The off road parking requirement for the proposals will be a minimum of 2 as per the Council's Adopted Parking Standards, which is and will remain available and therefore is considered acceptable.

### Other Matters

While support comments regarding the improvement of the facilities of the house to suit family needs are noted, this is not a material planning consideration in the determination of the application.

Reference has also been made to permission having been granted for similar proposals in Heath Terrace, however, no specific cases have been cited. In any case, each application must be assessed on its individual merits.

### **Summary/Conclusion**

The proposals would constitute a 69.3% addition to the house as originally built and is therefore considered to result in disproportionate additions which are inappropriate within the Green Belt harmful by definition and by reason of harm to openness and therefore contrary to the NPPF and Saved Local Plan Policy RAP2.

### **REFUSAL REASONS**

- 1 The application property is within the Green Belt, wherein the Local Planning Authority is concerned to ensure that the rural character of the area will be retained and protected in accordance with national policy guidance contained in the NPPF.

The NPPF states that the limited extension of existing buildings in the Green Belt may be appropriate provided that it does not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building. Policy RAP2 of the Warwick District Local Plan 1996-2011

specifies that extensions over 30% of the floor area of the original dwelling are likely to be considered disproportionate.

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposed 69.3% increase in floor space would radically alter the scale and character of the original dwelling, thus constituting an undesirable extension and consolidation of a residential property likely to affect detrimentally the character of this rural locality, thereby constituting inappropriate development conflicting with the aims of Green Belt and Local Plan policy.

The proposal is considered to be harmful by definition and by reason of harm to openness and is contrary to the aforementioned policies. No very special circumstances have been presented which are considered to outweigh the harm identified.

---