

PLANNING COMMITTEE - (Thursday 18th July 2024)

24/0903/FUL – Construction of single storey front, side and rear extensions at Silver Birch Cottage, East Lane, Abbots Langley, Hertfordshire, WD5 0NY

Parish: Abbots Langley Parish Council
Expiry of Statutory Period: 01.08.2024

Ward: Leavesden
Case Officer: Lilly Varnham

Recommendation: That PLANNING PERMISSION be REFUSED.

Reason for consideration by the Committee: The agent for this application is a Three Rivers District Council Ward Councillor.

To view all documents forming part of this application please go to the following website:

[24/0903/FUL | Construction of single storey front, side and rear extensions | Silver Birch Cottage East Lane Abbots Langley Hertfordshire WD5 0NY \(threerivers.gov.uk\)](https://www.threerivers.gov.uk/24/0903/FUL)

1 Relevant Planning History

- 1.1 8/397/79 - Change of Use. Chapel To Residential.
- 1.2 23/2183/FUL - Construction of single storey side extensions and relocation of entrance door – Permitted. Not implemented.
- 1.3 24/0383/PDE - Prior Approval: Single storey rear extension (depth 6.50 metres, maximum height 3.75 metres, maximum eaves height 3.75 metres) – Pending Consideration.
- 1.4 24/0382/CLPD - Certificate of Lawfulness Proposed Development: Construction of single storey side extension – Permitted. Not implemented.

2 Description of Application Site

- 2.1 The application site contains a single storey detached dwelling to the south of East Lane opposite East Lane Cemetery in Abbots Langley. The cottage was previously established for the residents of Abbots Langley Asylum and an earlier cemetery lies to the eastern border of the site. The existing dwelling is formed as a T plan shape with the addition of a conservatory to the southern part of the dwelling where land levels drop towards the rear boundary of the site.
- 2.2 The dwelling has a dark tiled slate roof form, with an exterior finish consisting of a light brown brick mix and a smooth white render. To the front of the dwelling is an existing vehicular access from East Lane onto a gravelled area of hardstanding which extends down the side of the dwelling, there is an existing car port structure within the site frontage which provides an area for parked vehicles. To the rear of the dwelling is large amenity garden predominantly laid as lawn, there are a number of large, detached outbuildings within the rear garden of the application site. It is noted that there is a secondary access to the site frontage from East Lane, whilst the gate remains the area to the rear of the gate (within the application site) is predominantly soft landscaping and does not appear to have been used for vehicular access for some time.
- 2.3 The application site is located within the Metropolitan Green Belt. There are no immediate residential neighbours to the application site.

3 Description of Proposed Development

- 3.1 The application seeks full planning permission for the construction of single storey front, side and rear extensions.

- 3.2 The proposed extension to the south elevation would be minimally set in from the eastern flank wall and would replace the existing conservatory to the rear of the dwelling. This projection would have a total depth of approximately 6.7m. This would extend across the width of the dwelling to adjoin the proposed extension to the western flank. The side extension would project some 6.9m beyond the western flank elevation and would wrap around to the northern elevation, stepping and splaying to follow the current splay of the existing dwelling. The northern extent of the side/front extension would be set back from the main front hipped projection by approximately 6m.
- 3.3 The extension to the southern (rear) elevation would have a hipped roof form that follows three pitches, set down from the main ridge line of the dwelling. This addition would have a total height of approximately 5.6m (taken from the lowest land level to the rear), sloping to an eaves height of 4.3m. Due to the drop in land levels to the rear of the site a raised decking is proposed from the southern projection. This would have a total depth beyond the proposed rear elevation of 4.2m, taking the total depth of new build beyond the existing rear elevation to some 10.9m. The proposed raised decking would not extend the full width of the rear elevation and instead would have a total width of approximately 7.7m and be positioned 2.1m above the lowest ground level (inclusive of the proposed balustrade). Five steps are proposed down from the decking to the lower land level. Within the rear elevation of the southern projection two sets of bifold doors are proposed and a single door is proposed to the patio store.
- 3.4 The extension to the western flank elevation would have a hipped roof set at the height of the main central section of the dwelling but would remain set down from the main front hipped projection. This addition would have a total height of approximately 5m (taken from the highest ground level adjacent to this elevation). The front projecting porch element would have a lower height with a separate pitched roof.
- 3.5 The projection to the western side of the northern elevation would also be comprised of a hipped roof, this would be set down from the main front hipped projection and would have a total height of approximately 5m, sloping to an eaves height of approximately 3.6m.
- 3.6 The proposed extension to the northeast would infill the existing space to this side of the dwelling and would have a total depth of approximately 4m extending in line with the existing flank wall. This addition would have a hipped roof form at a total height of approximately 4.7m (taken from the highest ground level adjacent to this elevation), sloping to an eaves height consistent with the central section of the host dwelling.
- 3.7 A number of rooflights are proposed within the existing and proposed rooflights. Fenestrations are proposed within the proposed extensions to the front, side and rear.
- 3.8 The proposed extensions would be constructed in brick to match the existing dwelling with clay and feature tiles to match the existing house. The existing ridge detail would be replicated on the ridge line of the proposed extensions.
- 3.9 It is acknowledged that this application has been submitted following the previously approved application via 23/2183/FUL. This current application contains a similar extension to the west elevation albeit on a larger footprint that what was approved. The extension to the east elevation (bed 2) is the same as what was previously approved with the addition of new fenestrations in the flank elevation. The remainder of the extensions to the West and South do not benefit from express planning permission, although it is the applicant's case that some of these elements benefit from deemed planning permission under the General Permitted Development Order and it is acknowledged that the application site has received prior approval for an extension to the south elevation via 24/0383/PDE and the a Lawful Development Certificate for an extension to the west elevation via 24/0382/CLPD. This matter is discussed further in the appraisal below.

4 Consultation

4.1 Statutory Consultation

4.1.1 Abbots Langley Parish Council: [No Comments Received]

4.1.2 HCC Footpath Section: [No Comments Received]

4.1.3 National Grid: [No Comments Received]

4.2 Public/Neighbour Consultation

4.2.1 Number consulted: 0 No of responses received: 0

4.2.2 Site Notice Displayed: 11.06.2024, Expires: 02.07.2024

4.2.3 Press notice published: 14.06.2024, Expires: 05.07.2024

4.2.4 Summary of Responses: [No responses received]

5 Reason for Delay

5.1 No Delay.

6 Relevant Planning Policy, Guidance and Legislation

6.1 Legislation

Planning applications are required to be determined in accordance with the statutory development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise as set out within S38(6) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and S70 of Town and Country Planning Act 1990).

The Localism Act received Royal Assent on 15 November 2011. The Growth and Infrastructure Act achieved Royal Assent on 25 April 2013.

The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 and the Habitat Regulations 1994 may also be relevant.

The Environment Act 2021.

6.2 Planning Policy and Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance

In December 2023 the revised NPPF was published, to be read alongside the online National Planning Practice Guidance. The NPPF is clear that “existing policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to the publication of this Framework. Due weight should be given to them, according to their degree of consistency with this Framework”.

The NPPF retains a presumption in favour of sustainable development. This applies unless any adverse impacts of a development would 'significantly and demonstrably' outweigh the benefits unless there is a clear reason for refusing the development (harm to a protected area).

The Three Rivers Local Development Plan

The application has been considered against the policies of the Local Plan, including the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011), the Development Management Policies Local Development Document (adopted July 2013) and the Site Allocations Local Development

Document (adopted November 2014) as well as government guidance. The policies of Three Rivers District Council reflect the content of the NPPF.

The Core Strategy was adopted on 17 October 2011 having been through a full public participation process and Examination in Public. Relevant policies include Policies CP1, CP9, CP10, CP11 and CP12.

The Development Management Policies Local Development Document (DMLDD) was adopted on 26 July 2013 after the Inspector concluded that it was sound following Examination in Public which took place in March 2013. Relevant policies include DM1, DM2, DM6, DM13 and Appendices 2 and 5.

Other

The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule (adopted February 2015).

Supplementary Planning Guidance No 3 – Extensions to Dwellings in the Green Belt (August 2003).

7 Planning Analysis

7.1 Impact on Metropolitan Green Belt

- 7.1.1 The application site is located within the Metropolitan Green Belt.
- 7.1.2 The fundamental aim of the Green Belt Policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open and the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.
- 7.1.3 Paragraph 142 of the NPPF states that the Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and permanence. With regard to extensions to buildings in the Green Belt the NPPF stipulates that provided extensions or alterations of a building do not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building it would not be inappropriate. In appropriate development by definition is harmful to the Green Belt.
- 7.1.4 The requirements of the NPPF are considered to reflect adopted policies of the Three Rivers District Council Local Plan. Core Strategy Policy CP11 sets out that there is a general presumption against inappropriate development that would not preserve the openness of the Green Belt, or which would conflict with the purposes of including land within it. Policy DM2 of the Development Management Policies document relates to development within the Green Belt and sets out that extensions to buildings in the Green Belt that are disproportionate in size (individually or cumulatively) to the original building will not be permitted. The building's proximity and relationship to other buildings and whether it is already, or would become, prominent in the setting and whether it preserves the openness of the Green Belt will be taken into account.
- 7.1.5 The 'Extensions to Dwellings in the Green Belt Supplementary Planning Guidance' provides further explanation of the interpretation of Green Belt policies of the Three Rivers Local Plan 1996-2011. These policies have now been superseded by Policy DM2 of the Development Management Policies LDD. Nevertheless, the SPG provides useful guidance and paragraph 4.5 of the Development Management Policies LDD advises that the guidance will be taken into account in the consideration of householder developments in the Green Belt until it is incorporated into the forthcoming Design Supplementary Planning Document. As a guide, the SPG advises that extensions resulting in a cumulative increase in floor space of more than 40% compared with the original dwelling may be disproportionate.

7.1.6 Paragraph 154 of the NPPF states that a Local Planning Authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. However, it states that exceptions to this are:

- a) Buildings for agriculture and forestry;
- b) Provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it
- c) The extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original buildings**
- d) The replacement of a building, provided that the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces
- e) Limited infilling in villages
- f) Limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the Development Plan (including policies for rural exception sites) and;
- g) Limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings) which would:
 - Not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or
 - Not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the Local Planning Authority.

7.1.7 Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. The NPPF states that when considering proposals, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt and that very special circumstances will not exist unless harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

7.1.8 Green Belt Calculations:

	Original Floor Space	Existing Extensions	Existing Percentage	Proposed Extensions	Percentage Increase
Permitted 23/2183/FUL	140sqm	29.88sqm	21%	37.8sqm	48%
Permitted 24/0383/PDE	140sqm	29.88sqm	21%	91.97sqm	66%
Permitted 24/0382/CLPD	140sqm	29.88	21%	39.85sqm	50%
Proposed	140sqm	29.88sqm	21%	170.49sqm	122%

7.1.9 The proposed extensions to the dwelling represent a cumulative increase of approximately 122% above the original floorspace of the dwelling. This would exceed the guideline of a 40% increase compared to that of the original floorspace of the dwelling within the

Metropolitan Green Belt. Notwithstanding the increase in floorspace, it is also important to consider the overall volume, design and bulk of the proposed development when concluding whether the extensions would cumulatively represent disproportionate additions, this analysis is set out below.

- 7.1.10 The SPG sets out that extensions resulting in a cumulative increase in floorspace of over 40% compared with the original dwelling will normally be unacceptable, with the following exceptions:
- i) Dormer windows satisfying 10(c) above, (ie. that they are proportionate to the existing building).
 - ii) Ground floor conservatories of modest size compared to the house and site, though planning conditions will then be imposed on permissions prohibiting their replacement with more substantial construction.
 - iii) 'in-fill' extensions (e.g. if the existing building is 'L' or 'U' shaped) which do not increase the apparent bulk of the building.
- 7.1.11 The proposed development is considered to result in an amalgamation of the previous approvals via 23/2183/FUL, 24/0383/PDE and 24/0382/CLPD. It is considered that some elements of the proposal can be considered to meet the exception at paragraph 11 d (iii) of the SPG, notably the extension to the northeast (labelled as Bed 2 on the plans) as this is the same as the previous approval via 23/2183/FUL and largely infills the existing space to this side of the dwelling without encroaching into the green belt beyond that of the established building line. The recessed extension to the west elevation (labelled as providing 2 study rooms) is also considered to meet the infill exception of the SPG and it is acknowledged that this element is the same as the previously approved application.
- 7.1.12 The extension to the south elevation is not considered to fall within any of the exceptions of the framework or the SPG and is therefore inappropriate development. The proposed extension would add significant bulk and mass to the rear elevation of the dwelling, exacerbated by the further projection of the timber decking which results in further encroachment into the Metropolitan Green Belt than the existing situation. It is acknowledged that the rear benefits from an existing single storey conservatory to the rear which has a deeper rear building line than the extension proposed under this application, however, the extension to the south would extend the full width of the dwelling, and whilst its roof form would be hipped it would result in three hipped projections that would add to the apparent bulk and massing resulting in greater visual impact than the existing situation. As such it is concluded that this extension would result in greater harm to the openness of the Green Belt.
- 7.1.13 The proposed extension to the West elevation to serve the new entrance hall, bed 4 and boot room is also not considered to fall within any of the exceptions of the framework or the SPG. The extension would project beyond the elevation and result in further encroachment into the Green Belt. It is acknowledged that an extension to this elevation was previously approved via 23/2183/FUL, however this was on a much smaller scale than the extension currently proposed. The extension would have a hipped roof however it would be set up to the central ridge running through the centre of the dwelling and owing to its overall width and depth would increase the prominence of the dwelling within the Green Belt to an unacceptable degree and would therefore amount to inappropriate development.
- 7.1.14 The current application results in the spread of development across the site, adding significant bulk and mass to the dwelling beyond that of the previous approval and would result in visual harm to the openness of the Green Belt. Officers note that the applicant's agent has highlighted the permitted development fallback position (i.e. the implementation of the prior approval rear extension and permitted development side extension), this position will be discussed in a later section of this report.

- 7.1.15 The applicant's agent has set out that the proposal would meet the exception of Policy DM2 for the re-use and conversion of buildings in the Green Belt. Officers do not consider that the proposal would fall within this exception given that the use as a residential dwelling has been long established permitted via 8/397/79 and is considered to have the basic and necessary amenities for current use and occupation as a residential unit. This application relates to extensions to an existing dwelling and not to the re-use or conversion of a building.
- 7.1.16 Noting the above, the overall mass and bulk of the proposed development would significantly increase the prominence of the dwelling both spatially and visually. The level of harm to spatial openness is considered to be limited given the permitted development fallback position and the previous planning approval. However, there would be a clear cumulative marked harm on the visual openness of the Green Belt particularly when viewed from the west (side) and south (rear) elevations.
- 7.1.17 In summary, the proposed development is considered to result in disproportionate additions to the original building which would be harmful to the openness of the Green Belt. Therefore, it would be inappropriate development.
- 7.1.18 The proposed development would therefore fail to comply with Policy CP11 of the Core Strategy (October 2011), Policy DM2 of the Development Management Policies Document (October 2013) and the Supplementary Planning Guidance No 3 – Extensions to Dwellings in the Green Belt (August 2003) and the NPPF (December 2023).
- 7.2 Design and Impact on Character and Appearance of the host dwelling and wider streetscene.
- 7.2.1 Policy CP1 of the Core Strategy seeks to promote buildings of a high enduring design quality that respect local distinctiveness and Policy CP12 of the Core Strategy relates to design and states that in seeking a high standard of design, the Council will expect development proposals to 'have regard to the local context and conserve or enhance the character, amenities and quality of an area' and 'conserve and enhance natural and heritage assets'.
- 7.2.2 Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies Local Development Document (adopted July 2013) set out that development should not lead to a gradual deterioration in the quality of the built environment, have a significant impact on the visual amenities of the area and that extensions should respect the existing character of the dwelling, particularly with regard to the roof form, positioning and style of windows and doors, and materials.
- 7.2.3 As set out Appendix 2, new development should not be excessively prominent in relation to adjacent properties or general street scene and should not result in a loss of light to the windows of neighbouring properties nor allow for overlooking. Appendix 2 of the DMP LDD also sets out that single storey side extensions proximity to the flank boundary will be individually assessed.
- 7.2.4 The application dwelling is set back from the highway on East Lane by approximately 15m and is the last residential dwelling that is accessible from this portion of the highway. The rest of East Lane from this location is passable on foot only, despite this it is considered that views of the proposed development would be had from East Lane, the arable fields to the West and Leavesden Country Park. The proposed extensions are considered to add significant bulk and massing to the dwelling, particularly to the West (side) elevation and the South (rear) elevation however, when considered the spacing maintained to the boundaries of the site, and that the extensions would be set down from the main ridge line and front hipped projection it is not considered that the extensions would appear unduly prominent such to justify the refusal of planning permission in this regard.
- 7.2.5 It is considered that some elements of the proposed development would be considered infill notably those serving bed 2 and the study, which would not project beyond the current

established building line. Whilst the extensions to the west and south of the dwelling would project beyond the current footprint it is acknowledged that the rear projection would replace the existing conservatory albeit at a greater width, this position has also been established through the prior approval application via 24/0383/PDE. In terms of the addition to the rear, whilst the depth would fail to comply with the guidelines it would remain set in from the flank elevation and down from the ridge. Its roof would be hipped and it would not project beyond the depth of the existing conservatory. As such it is not considered that this would result in demonstrable harm to the character of the host dwelling such to justify refusal of planning permission in this regard. The addition proposed to the West would project beyond the current established building line to serve as the new main entrance to the dwelling. Whilst this addition would be prominent, given the set down and hipped roof it is not considered that this would appear incongruous within the context of the host dwelling or the plot.

- 7.2.6 The proposed development would be set up to the ridge line of the central section of the dwelling but would remain set down from the existing prominent forward projection that served the former chapel of rest which serves as a focal point upon entry to the site. The proposed extensions would not project beyond the eastern flank wall and would remain set back from the front elevation and set off the flank boundaries. Given the spacing maintained to the boundaries and that the additions are subservient to the host dwelling it is not considered that the proposal would result in an incongruous or overly prominent form of development and would therefore not be considered to result in demonstrable harm to the character of the host dwelling or wider streetscene.
- 7.2.7 The proposed alterations would be constructed in materials to match the existing dwelling including brick and clay/feature tiles. The fenestration and ridge details are proposed to be replicated to match those details of the existing dwelling which would respond to the existing character of the host dwelling and retain its appearance within the wider streetscene.
- 7.2.8 The proposed timber decking to the rear would not be readily visible from the streetscene on East Lane given its siting to the rear. The proposed decking would replace an existing decking that serves the existing conservatory, the proposed decking would be of a greater depth and width than the existing, however given its overall limited scale and that it would be set off the boundary it is not considered that this would result in demonstrable harm to the character of the dwelling or wider streetscene.
- 7.2.1 In summary, the proposed development would not result in any adverse harm to the character or appearance of the host dwelling or streetscene. The development would be acceptable in this regard in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (2011) and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (2013).

7.3 Impact on amenity of neighbours

- 7.3.1 Policy CP12 of the Core Strategy states that development should 'protect residential amenities by taking into account the need for adequate levels and disposition of privacy, prospect, amenity and garden space' and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies document set out that development should not result in loss of light to the windows of neighbouring properties nor allow overlooking and should not be excessively prominent in relation to adjacent properties.
- 7.3.2 The closest residential neighbour to the application site is Farm Cottage, this neighbour does not adjoin the application site boundary and is set over 100 metres from the application site's rear elevation. East of the site is a Cemetery and to the south-east are the former asylum administration structures. The rest of the site is surrounded by arable fields and Leavesden Country Park. In light of the existing site circumstances, it is not considered that the proposed development would result in any harm to the residential amenities of the occupiers of any neighbouring dwelling.

7.3.3 In summary, the proposed development would not result in any adverse impact on any neighbouring dwelling and the development would be acceptable in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (2011) and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (2013).

7.4 Rear Garden Amenity Space Provision

7.4.1 Policy CP12 of the Core Strategy states that development should take into account the need for adequate levels and disposition of amenity and garden space. Section 3 (Amenity Space) of Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies document provides indicative levels of amenity/garden space provision.

7.4.2 The application dwelling currently has two bedrooms and a large study, the proposal would increase the number of bedrooms within the dwelling by two to create a four-bedroom dwelling. Following implementation of the development the application site would retain approximately 4482sqm of rear amenity space which would exceed the guidelines set out at Appendix 2 of the DMP LDD. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in this regard.

7.5 Wildlife and Biodiversity

7.5.1 Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 requires Local Planning Authorities to have regard to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. This is further emphasised by regulation 3(4) of the Habitat Regulations 1994 which state that Councils must have regard to the strict protection for certain species required by the EC Habitats Directive. The Habitats Directive places a legal duty on all public bodies to have regard to the habitats directive when carrying out their functions.

7.5.2 The protection of biodiversity and protected species is a material planning consideration in the assessment of this application in accordance with Policy CP9 of the Core Strategy and Policy DM6 of the Development Management Policies LDD. National Planning Policy requires Local Authorities to ensure that a protected species survey is undertaken for applications where biodiversity may be affected prior to the determination of a planning application. The application is accompanied by a biodiversity checklist which states that no protected species or biodiversity interests will be affected as a result of the application. The Local Planning Authority is not aware of any records of protected species within the immediate area that would necessitate further surveying work being undertaken.

7.6 Mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain

7.6.1 Paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 sets out that every planning permission granted for the development of land in England shall be deemed to have been granted subject to the 'biodiversity gain condition' requiring development to achieve a net gain of 10% of biodiversity value. This is subject to exemptions, and an exemption applies in relation to planning permission for a development which is the subject of a householder application, within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order (2015).

7.6.2 The applicant has confirmed that if permission is granted for the development to which this application relates the biodiversity gain condition would not apply because the application relates to householder development.

7.7 Trees and Landscaping

7.7.1 Policy DM6 of the Development Management Policies LDD sets out that development proposals should seek to retain trees and other landscape and nature conservation features, and that proposals should demonstrate that trees will be safeguarded and managed during and after development in accordance with the relevant British Standards.

7.7.2 The application site is not located within the Conservation Area. There are however a number of large trees within the application site, none of which appear to be protected by a Tree Preservation Order. The existing trees on site are separated from the area of the proposed development which would be sited on an area of existing hardstanding. As such, it is not considered that any trees would be affected as a result of the proposed development. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in this regard.

7.8 Highways, Access and Parking

7.8.1 Core Strategy Policy CP10 (adopted October 2011) requires development to make adequate provision for all users, including car parking. Policy DM13 in the Development Management Policies document (adopted July 2013) states that development should make provision for parking in accordance with the Parking Standards set out within Appendix 5.

7.8.2 The application dwelling currently has two bedrooms and a large study, and the proposal would seek to increase the provision by two, to create a four-bedroom dwelling. Appendix 5 of the DMP LDD sets out that four or more-bedroom dwellings would require 3 assigned spaces within the dwelling's curtilage. The application dwelling has an existing driveway and a car port with off street parking for more than 3 vehicles, no alterations are proposed to the existing hardstanding and as such the proposal is considered to comply with the above guidelines. As such, the proposal is considered acceptable in this regard.

7.9 Very Special Circumstances

7.9.1 The NPPF sets out the following with regard to inappropriate development:

7.9.2 Paragraph 152 of the NPPF states that *'Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances'*.

7.9.3 Paragraph 153 further outlines that *'When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very Special Circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of its inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.'*

7.9.4 In addition to the above the applicant's agent has highlighted that the fallback position (ie the implementation of the prior approval rear extension and permitted development side extension) plus the previous planning approval amount to a 130% increase in floor area. When officers have calculated the percentage increases across the application this has been calculated at approximately 121%. Whilst this is also significantly above that under the previous planning approval officers would note that the application 23/2183/FUL and 24/0382/CLPD would never be able to be implemented together as the implementation of both would invalidate the permissions as neither would then be accord with the approved plans. Officers note that the applicant's agent has drawn attention to the potential of a further side extension to the east, this fallback position has not been established and is therefore afforded limited weight.

7.9.5 It is acknowledged that the site has established a permitted development fallback position via 24/0383/PDE and 24/0382/CLPD, and if implemented together would result in a cumulative increase of 94% above the original, whilst this is afforded moderate weight in the planning balance officers consider that the permitted development fallback position is less harmful to the Green Belt than the application currently which proposes a 122% increase. The proposed development is considered to add significant bulk and massing to the dwelling which would result in further encroachment into the Green Belt beyond the established building line, It is acknowledged that the extensions proposed under this application do not project as deep as those under the Lawful Development Certificate and Prior Approval scheme. However, in this case the depth of the extension to the south extends across the whole width, would have three hipped roofs and proposes a terrace that

projects further into the Green Belt than the previous approvals. The extension to the west would add an increased bulk and roof level which would increase the apparent bulk and mass of the dwelling to an unacceptable degree. The extensions in this case are considered to add apparent bulk and mass to the dwelling increasing the visual prominence and impact on the Green Belt.

7.9.6 The extension to the south and west (entrance hall, bed 4 and boot room) are considered to be inappropriate development that does not meet any of the relevant exceptions. Taking the various aspects of the proposed development as a whole, and the level of accommodation that can be achieved through the fallback position and previous approval it is still considered that cumulatively the fallback position would be less harmful than that currently proposed.

7.9.7 In this case, it is considered that the proposed development would result in actual harm to the Metropolitan Green Belt by reason of the increase in bulk and massing to the side and rear of the dwelling, and the cumulative impact of the disproportionate additions on the original dwelling. No very special circumstances have been identified or presented which would outweigh this harm.

8 Recommendation

8.1 That PLANNING PERMISSION BE REFUSED, for the following reason:

R1 The proposed extensions, by virtue of their floor area, their scale and massing would represent disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building and would therefore constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt by definition, resulting in demonstrable harm to the openness of the Metropolitan Green Belt. The development would therefore be contrary Policy CP11 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

8.2 Informatives:

I1 The Local Planning Authority has been positive and proactive in considering this planning application in line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. The Local Planning Authority encourages applicants to have pre-application discussions as advocated in the NPPF. The applicant and/or their agent did not have formal pre-application discussions with the Local Planning Authority and the proposed development fails to comply with the requirements of the Development Plan and does not maintain/improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the District.