



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 July 2007

by **Geoffrey Hill** BSc DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State
for Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email:enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Date: 13 August 2007

Appeal Ref: APP/R1845/A/07/2040997

Upper Birch Farm, Shatterford, Bewdley DY12 1TR

- 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 C Bagnall against the decision of Wyre Forest District Council.
- The application Ref 06/1133/FULL, dated 6 November 2006, was refused by notice dated 29 December 2006.
- The development proposed is a two storey extension.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Reasons

2. The property is within the Green Belt. No objections were raised by the Council to the scale or extent of the extensions, only to their appearance. I acknowledge that the Council has granted planning permission for similar sized extensions in 2005 and that this would be the "fall back" position should this appeal be dismissed. However, each new development (and subsequent appeal) has to be determined on its own merits. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that a planning application should be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Policy GB.1 iii) of the Wyre Forest District Local Plan looks to resist disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original dwelling. This is in accordance with paragraph 3.6 of Planning Policy Guidance 2 *Green Belts* (PPG2).
3. Set out as an Annex to this decision is a table showing the history of successive extensions to this house, comparing the figures given by the appellant and the Council. These figures are not exactly the same but both sets purport to represent the same (ie the present) situation. This shows that the original building has already been extended by some 36% according to the appellant's figures or 40% using the Council's interpretation of the history of the dwelling.
4. The proposed scheme would add a further 504.76 cubic metres (or 491.34 cubic metres calculated by the Council). This would represent a 90% enlargement over the original using the appellant's figures, or 104% using the Council's figures. That is, there is agreement that the scheme will result in close to (or slightly exceeding) a doubling of the size of the original dwelling. In my view, this would represent a disproportionate enlargement and hence

would be contrary to the policies of the development plan. This would also be inappropriate development in the Green Belt according to PPG2.

5. Paragraph 3.2 of PPG2 advises that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and goes on to say that very special circumstances are needed to justify such development. For the appellant it is argued the current appeal represents only a further 1% enlargement over the 2005 planning permission. I acknowledge that the degree of difference between the 2005 permission and the present scheme is quite small but this does not represent special – let alone very special – circumstances to justify allowing inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
6. Turning now to the reasons for refusal given by the Council for the application, policy D.17 of the Wyre Forest District Local Plan looks for extensions to be subservient to the original building. The original building is not easy to discern as a consequence of the previous extensions which have seemingly created a new front elevation. In which case, the only sensible interpretation of the policy has to be to have regard to the appearance of the house as it currently stands. The proposed scheme would significantly alter the character and appearance of the property, effectively creating a larger and more assertive main front elevation, marked by the present and proposed gable ends, with flanking wings. In my view this would not accord with the requirements of the policy.
7. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Geoffrey Hill

INSPECTOR

ANNEX

HISTORY OF EXTENSIONS AND RESULTING INCREASES IN SIZE OF HOUSE.

	<i>Appellant's figures</i>			<i>Council's figures</i>		
	<i>Size of dev. (cubic m.)</i>	<i>Cumulative size (cubic m.)</i>	<i>% increase over original</i>	<i>Size of dev. (cubic m.)</i>	<i>Cumulative size (cubic m.)</i>	<i>% increase over original</i>
<i>Original house</i>	938.36			762.63		
<i>Extensions pre- 2003</i>	342.22	1280.58	+36.47	197.27	959.90	+25.8
<i>Appeal scheme</i>	504.76	1785.34	+90.26	109.10	1069.00	+40.17
				491.34	1560.34	+104.59