



# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2009

**by Roland Punshon BSc (Hons) 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](mailto:enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk)

**Decision date:  
21 December 2009**

## **Appeal Ref: APP/R1845/D/09/2115259**

### **Seagars, Lambsie Lane, Shenstone, Kidderminster DY10 4DA**

- 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 J Walls against the decision of Wyre Forest District Council.
- The application Ref 09/0434/FULL, dated 16 June 2009, was refused by notice dated 13 August 2009.
- The development proposed is first storey bedrooms and en-suite extension, new chimney to lounge and double garage extension.

### **Decision**

1. I dismiss the appeal.

### **Main issue**

2. I consider that the main issue in this case is whether the proposal would comprise inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

### **Reasons**

3. Paragraph 3.1 of Planning Policy Guidance: Green Belts (PPG2) makes clear that, within the Green Belt, there is a general presumption against inappropriate development and that such development should not be permitted except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 3.2 advises that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and that it is for the appellant to show why permission should be granted. The construction of new buildings is inappropriate development unless the building is required for one of the purposes set out in paragraph 3.4 but the proposal does not fall into any of the defined purposes. However, paragraph 3.6 states the extension or alteration of a dwelling in the Green Belt is not inappropriate development provided that the works do not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. This guidance is reflected in the provisions of Policy GB.1 of the adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan and Policy D.39 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan 1996-2011.
4. The appellant does not dispute the Council's claim that the original building was the essentially single storey scale house as it existed before being extended in the mid-1980s. From the written submissions which I have and from my own observations made on site, it would appear that this mid-1980s extension involved the provision of an additional floor of accommodation over a single storey element at the side of the main house. The current proposal would involve the addition of an additional floor of accommodation over a single

storey element on the other side of the house. The current proposal would be significantly larger than the extension already carried out.

5. In my opinion the proposal, when considered alongside the extension already carried out, would be a disproportionate addition to the original building. The resultant structure would be much more bulky and the essentially single storey scale of the original building would be overwhelmed by the double, forward-projecting, 2 storey gables. These would tend to dominate the front elevation making the house a much more prominent building when viewed from the road. From the open land to the west the existing simple gable and sloping roof would be replaced by a much greater mass of vertical brickwork with a variety of features including dormer windows and a chimney stack. In my opinion the proposal would appear much more substantial than the existing structure when seen from this direction.
6. I accept that the proposed extension would not result in the building having a 'footprint' which is any greater than that of the existing building. Nonetheless, I consider that the increase in bulk and massing of the structure compared to the original building would result in a building which encroaches to a greater extent into the countryside.
7. The proposed double garage would be an open, wooden-framed structure with a tiled roof which would be located in a detached position at the front the main house. It would be largely screened from the road by hedges. I note that the Council has no objection to this part of the proposal. Although the garage would amount to a new building, given the degree of its separation from the main house and its light-weight construction, I do not consider that it would appear disproportionate to the original house when considered alongside the extension already carried out. In a letter accompanying the original planning application the appellant's agent suggests that the appellant already has permission for a car port at the property. If this is so then the effect on openness arising from the addition of the double garage may be more substantial. Given this doubt I am unwilling to issue a split decision and to grant permission for the garage by itself.
8. The appellant has put forward no other material considerations to be taken into account.
9. I conclude the proposal would comprise inappropriate development in the Green Belt which would be harmful to openness and which would increase encroachment. It would be contrary to Local Plan Policy GB.1, Structure Plan Policy D.39 and the guidance in PPG2.
10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Roland Punshon*

INSPECTOR