



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 October 2008

by **Richard Thomas BA, Dip Arch, RIBA, IHBC**

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

Agenda Item No. 7

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

Decision date:
4 November 2008

Appeal Ref: APP/R1845/A/08/2078271

Savilles Garage, Mustow Green, Kidderminster, DY10 4LG

- 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 Savilles Garage against the decision of Wyre Forest District Council.
- The application Ref.07/1152/FULL, dated 12 November 2007, was refused by notice dated 7 January 2008.
- The development proposed is an extension for cleaning bays.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main issue

2. Whether the proposed development would constitute inappropriate development within the West Midlands Green Belt and, if so, are any very special circumstances to outweigh the presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a car sales and servicing garage, prominently situated at the crossroads of the A448 and A450 on the edge of the small settlement of Mustow Green. The site lies within the Green Belt and Planning Policy Guidance 2 *Green Belts* (PPG2) states that there is a general presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
4. Inappropriate development within the Green Belt is, by definition, harmful and very special circumstances are required to justify such development. While certain categories of new buildings are identified as being considered appropriate, these do not include the extension of existing commercial premises, such as the appeal site. Consequently, the proposed extension constitutes inappropriate development and is therefore harmful to the Green Belt.
5. The proposed extension would result in the extension of the workshop building by some 6.5m towards the roundabout. Although lower in height than the ridge of the existing building, the proposed extension would still be a prominent addition. It would increase the mass of the building and, because of its prominent location would visually encroach into the surrounding countryside, reducing the openness of the surrounding area and thus conflicting with one of the purposes of including land in the Green Belt.

6. I have considered the appellant's arguments in support of the proposed extension. It is acknowledged that the proposed extension would afford shelter for staff when valeting cars in winter months, provide secure storage for three vehicles and create further employment opportunities on the site. However, I note that broadly similar arguments could be made in respect of most other commercial buildings in the Green Belt. Consequently, I do not consider these benefits constitute very special circumstances, or are sufficient to outweigh both the policy and real harm that the proposed development would cause to the character of the Green Belt.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposed extension would conflict with the guidance in PPG2, with Policy D.39 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan (2001) and with Policies GB.1, GB.2, GB.6, D.5 and D.18 of the Wyre Forest District Local Plan (2004).

Richard Thomas

Inspector