

Planning Committee: 10 September 2019

Item Number: 10

Application No: [W 19 / 0961](#)

Town/Parish Council: Stoneleigh

Case Officer: George Whitehouse

01926 456553 george.whitehouse@warwickdc.gov.uk

Registration Date: 07/06/19

Expiry Date: 02/08/19

9 Stoneleigh Close, Stoneleigh, Coventry, CV8 3DE

Erection of a hip to gable roof conversion raising the roof height by a minimum of 0.5 (from the existing ridge) and a maximum of 3.5m (from the existing eaves) with the erection of 1no. dormer to the front and 3. no dormers to the rear. FOR Mr Brooks

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

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended the Planning Committee refuse this application for the reasons set out in this report.

DETAILS OF THE DEVELOPMENT

Erection of a hip to gable roof conversion raising the roof height by a minimum of 0.5 (from the existing ridge) and a maximum of 3.5m (from the existing eaves) with the erection of 1no. dormer to the front and 3. no dormers to the rear.

THE SITE AND ITS LOCATION

9 Stoneleigh Close is a detached bungalow on the eastern side of the close. The property is within the greenbelt and while there are neighbouring properties either side and across the street there are no immediate neighbours to the rear.

PLANNING HISTORY

BC/09/01398/BN - Loft conversion to dwelling

RELEVANT POLICIES

- National Planning Policy Framework
- [The Current Local Plan](#)
- BE1 - Layout and Design (Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029)
- BE3 - Amenity (Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029)
- H14 - Extensions to Dwellings in the Open Countryside (Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029)
- DS18 - Green Belt (Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029)

- NE2 - Protecting Designated Biodiversity and Geodiversity Assets (Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029)
- TR3 - Parking (Warwick District Local Plan - 2011-2029)
- Guidance Documents
- Residential Design Guide (Supplementary Planning Document- May 2018)
- The 45 Degree Guideline (Supplementary Planning Guidance)
- Parking Standards (Supplementary Planning Document)

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

Stoneleigh and Ashow Parish Council: Support

Warwickshire County Council Ecology: Objection based on bat roosts in close proximity.

ASSESSMENT

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

Paragraph 133 of the NPPF notes that the Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances (paragraph 143). With a number of exceptions, the construction of new buildings (including extensions) is inappropriate development (paragraph 145). Among the exceptions is "the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building".

The explanatory text to Local Plan Policy DS18 states that the meaning of the exception in relation to disproportionate extensions is expanded upon by Local Plan Policy H14. Policy H14 states that extensions to dwellings will be permitted unless they result in disproportionate additions to the original dwelling which do not respect the character of the original dwelling; do not retain the openness of the rural area; or substantially alter the scale, design and character of the original dwelling. Policy H14 goes on to indicate that an extension of more than 30% of the gross floor space of the original dwelling is likely to be considered disproportionate in the Green Belt.

The total original floor space of the application property is calculated to be 181.15 sqm. The first floor extension now proposed amounts to 121.59 sqm. This represents a 67.12% increase in the floor area of the dwelling. This is well in excess of the 30% limit detailed in Policy H14 and therefore is considered to be a disproportionate addition to the dwelling. The proposal is therefore inappropriate development in the Green Belt which is harmful by definition and by reason of harm to openness. In accordance with the NPPF, this harm must be afforded significant weight. The applicants questioned the Council's inclusion of unusable internal floor space in the calculation. However, in order to assess the increase in the size of the building, and any resulting harm to openness, the increase in gross floor space is used as a guide. It does not matter whether the

additional floor space is usable or not; additional development where previously there was nothing impacts openness.

It is notable that the Inspector for the appeal relating to 17 Stoneleigh Close, which was dismissed, took account of the increase in the height and volume of the building as well as the increase in floor space. It was the combination of the increase in floor space and the increase in height and volume that lead him to conclude that the proposals would amount to a disproportionate addition. It is noted the proposed increase in ridge height proposed as part of this application is similar to that proposed at number 17 and the inspectors decision which noted a significant increase in the height and volume of the building, amounting to a whole additional floor of development was harmful to the openness of the Greenbelt is relevant and applicable to this application being consistent with the Council and Planning inspectors previous recent decisions along this close it is considered this application should too be refused for the same reason.

The Parish Council have issued a stance of support but have not provided any reason to justify or explain this support comment. In absence of this and given consideration to the proposal it is not considered there are any very special circumstances have been presented which outweighs the conflict with Green Belt policy or the harm identified.

For these reasons it has been concluded that the proposals amount to inappropriate development that would reduce the openness of the Green Belt. No very special circumstances have been presented which outweighs the conflict with Green Belt policy or the harm identified therefore the proposals do not comply with local plan policy H14.

Impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers

Although the proposals represent an increase in size due to the siting of the additional mass it is not considered that the amenity of neighbouring occupiers are impacted to a level that could be considered significant, there is no breach of the 45 degree guideline and the proposals do not introduce an unacceptable level of overlooking.

It is considered the proposals comply with local plan policy BE3

Ecology

The County Ecologist has recommended that a preliminary bat survey is required prior to the determination of the application. I have considered this request and note that the existing dwelling is located in an area with other dwellings in close proximity. In addition, this property already has its roof space converted to habitable accommodation.

On this basis, I do not consider that it is appropriate or practicable to request a bat survey be submitted. In coming to this conclusion, I am mindful of location of the property, the characteristics of the local area and the fact that bats are a protected species under separate legislation and there is a duty of care by the applicants to ensure protected species are not harmed by the proposal.

On the basis of the above, I consider that the imposition of an explanatory note regarding the applicant's responsibility with regard to protected species is sufficient in this case.

Summary

Although the proposals are acceptable in terms of their design within the street scene and impact on the neighbouring occupiers the additional bulk and mass represents a 67.12% increase in the floor area of the dwelling. This is well in excess of the 30% guide set out in policy H14. The combination of the increase in floor space and the increase in height and volume mean that the proposals would amount to a disproportionate addition and do not comply with Local Plan Policy H14 this application should therefore be refused by the planning committee.

REFUSAL REASONS

- 1 In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposed development represents a disproportionate addition to the original building and therefore constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt which is harmful by definition and by reason of harm to openness. No very special circumstances are considered to exist which outweigh the harm identified.

The proposed development is therefore contrary to the National Policy Framework and to Policy H14 of the Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029.
