



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 August 2010

by **Louise Crosby MA 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

Decision date:
3 September 2010

Appeal Ref: APP/R1845/A/10/2125402

The Orchard, Worcester Road, Harvington, Kidderminster, Worcestershire, DY10 4LZ

- 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 N Perrins against the decision of Wyre Forest District Council.
- The application Ref: 09/0559/FULL, dated 31 July 2009, was refused by notice dated 30 September 2009.
- The development proposed is erection of first floor bedroom with en-suite and pitched roof over garage.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main issues

2. The main issues are:
 - whether the proposed extension is inappropriate development in the Green Belt;
 - whether there would be any other harm to the Green Belt; and
 - if it is inappropriate development, whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development.

Reasons

3. The Orchard is an extended part two storey and part single storey dwelling standing in its own grounds, outside of the village of Harvington, in open countryside. Paragraph 3.4 of PPG2 sets out the types of new buildings within the Green Belt that are not inappropriate and this includes "limited extension, alteration or replacement of existing dwellings". Paragraph 3.6 of PPG2 clarifies that this is subject to it not resulting in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original dwelling. This advice is reflected in adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan (LP) policy GB1.
4. According to the Council, the proposed first floor extension would, in conjunction with previous extensions, result in an increase in the size of the original dwelling of around 260%. This is not disputed by the appellant. In my opinion, the proposal would clearly result in a disproportionate addition and so the proposal would constitute inappropriate development within the Green Belt.

PPG2 advises that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and that the Secretary of State will attach substantial weight to the harm to the Green Belt in considering such development.

5. The most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. The proposed extension would occupy a substantial area above an existing large flat roofed extension on the side of the dwelling. The increase in height and bulk of this part of the dwelling would reduce openness, particularly when viewed from the open fields to the north-west of the appeal site since this boundary hedge is lower and less dense than the others. This would cause further harm to the Green Belt and also undermine the national and local planning policies that seek to protect it.
6. I realise that the appellant requires the extension to provide additional family accommodation. I am also mindful that because the extension would be built on top of the large flat roofed extension and have a pitched roof; it would improve the appearance of the dwelling. However, these matters do not clearly outweigh the significant harm arising from its inappropriateness, and the harm that it would cause to the openness of the Green Belt.
7. Overall, I conclude that the other considerations in favour of the proposal do not clearly outweigh the general presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt, the substantial weight to be attached to the harm caused by the inappropriateness of the development and the harm to the openness of the Green Belt. Therefore, the necessary very special circumstances to justify the proposal do not exist.
8. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Louise Crosby

INSPECTOR