Planning Committee: 18 June 2019 **Item Number:** 7

Application No: W 19 / 0519

Registration Date: 27/03/19
Town/Parish Council: Beausale, Haseley, Honiley & Wroxall **Expiry Date:** 22/05/19
Case Officer: Dan Charles
01926 456527 dan.charles@warwickdc.gov.uk

Red House Farm, Red House Farm Lane, Beausale, Warwick, CV35 7NZ
Erection of single storey side extension to existing detached garage including installation of 4kW solar PV installation on the South and West-facing roof slopes
FOR Mr S Turner

This application is being presented to Committee as the Parish Council supports the application and it is recommended for refusal.

RECOMMENDATION

Planning Committee is recommended to refuse planning permission, for the reasons set out at the end of this report.

DETAILS OF THE DEVELOPMENT

The proposal is for the erection of an extension to an existing detached double garage to create additional storage space at ground floor with the provision of a solar array to the roof structure of the proposed building.

It is proposed to amend the appearance of the garage to match the detailing of the extension by the use of timber cladding to match the extension.

The existing garage has a footprint of 40 square metres. The proposed extension equates to approximately 65 square metres.

THE SITE AND ITS LOCATION

The application site relates to a two storey detached farm house dwelling which is Grade II Listed. The property dates from c. C18 and has been altered and extended significantly since its original construction. The property benefits from an existing conservatory extension, of relatively modern design, to the rear which is to be demolished and replaced as part of this proposal.

The character of the dwelling is defined by the use of timber windows, red facing brickwork with a sandstone plinth and the roof of the dwelling is steeply pitched with gable ends. There are 3 modest and pitched roof dormer windows set into the eaves to the rear of the dwelling in addition to a large single storey rear/side extension.

The existing garage is of modern construction being built following planning permission granted in 1999. It is a simple, dual gabled, double garage standing to the rear of the property.

PLANNING HISTORY

W/18/2448 – Demolition of existing rear conservatory and front porch canopy and erection of a single storey rear extension and new porch canopy; installation of new rooflights to the existing single storey rear wing; existing doors installed within the south elevation to be reinstated to a window; doors installed within the west facing gable of the single storey component to be widened; existing masonry details are to be retained or improved; replacement of the hedge at the road side with a low wall of stone construction - GRANTED 29.03.2019

W/14/0521/LB - Replacement of Circa 70's/80's inappropriate windows with traditionally styled casement windows - Granted 31.05.2014.

W/04/0895 and W/04/0971/LB - Erection of a conservatory – Both granted 02.07.2004.

W/99/0930 & W/99/0931/LB - Erection of a rear single storey extension and conservatory; insertion of window to front elevation, internal alterations, erection of a detached double garage; extension to residential curtilage – Granted 14.10.1999.

W/87/0995 - Demolition of a porch and store, erection of a porch and dormer windows, internal alterations and alterations to elevations. - Granted 20.10.1987.

RELEVANT POLICIES

- National Planning Policy Framework
- The Current Local Plan
- DS18 - Green Belt (Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029)
- H14 - Extensions to Dwellings in the Open Countryside (Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029)
- BE1 - Layout and Design (Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029)
- BE3 - Amenity (Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029)
- HE1 - Protection of Statutory Heritage Assets (Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029)
- NE2 - Protecting Designated Biodiversity and Geodiversity Assets (Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029)
- Guidance Documents
- Residential Design Guide (Supplementary Planning Document- May 2018)

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

Beausale, Haseley, Honiley & Wroxall Parish Council: Supports the application.

WCC Ecology: No objection subject to conditions and notes.

ASSESSMENT

Whether the proposal constitutes appropriate development in the Green Belt and if not whether there are any very special circumstances which outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm identified

As the application site lies within the Green Belt, the proposal must be assessed against Policy DS18 of the Local Plan. The policy states that development must be in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Green Belt provisions.

The NPPF states that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts being their openness and their permanence. Paragraph 143 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.

Paragraph 145 lists certain exceptions within the Green Belt. Point (c) states that development can acceptable if *"the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building"*

In terms of making an assessment of what is considered disproportionate, Policy H14 of the Local Plan states that extensions greater than 30% of the floor area of the original building are likely to be considered as disproportionate.

The proposed development would result in an increase in floorspace of approximately 160% over the floorspace of the original building. It is therefore considered that the proposed extension represents a disproportionate addition to the property, which is harmful by definition and by reason of harm to openness to the Green Belt.

The applicants state in support of the application that the building is substantially screened and not easily visible from the public domain which limits the impact. In addition, the proposal would allow for solar panels to be installed supporting sustainability objectives. In assessing these matters, Officers note that Green Belt is not a landscape designation and therefore, the level of visibility of the building is not a material consideration that would amount to very special circumstances. Openness must be protected for its own sake, whether the site is visible or not. In addition, the provision of sustainable energy sources would also not amount to very special circumstances.

The proposal is therefore considered to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and is therefore contrary to Policy DS18 and Paragraph 145 and 146 of the NPPF.

Design and impact on visual amenity and the character of surrounding area

Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) places significant weight on ensuring good design which is a key aspect of sustainable development and should positively contribute towards making places better for people. The NPPF states that permission should be refused for development of

poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving character, the quality of an area and the way it functions.

Policy BE1 of the Local Plan reinforces the importance of good design stipulated by the NPPF as it requires all development to respect surrounding buildings in terms of scale, height, form and massing. The Local Plan requires development to be constructed using appropriate materials and seeks to ensure that the appearance of the development and its relationship with the surrounding built and natural environment does not detrimentally impact the character of the local area.

In addition, the Residential Design Guide SPD sets out steps which must be followed in order to achieve good design in terms of the impact on the local area; the importance of respecting existing important features; respecting the surrounding buildings and using the right materials.

In terms of visual amenity, the building is located to the rear of the site and the extension would be screened by existing boundary treatments. The visibility from the public highway is limited as the main structure of the garage extension screens the extension.

The extension is subservient to the main garage building in terms of height and appearance. While the scale of the building does exceed the footprint of the existing building, the lower ridge height ensures the building does not overpower the existing garage building.

In terms of general visual amenity and the character of the area, the proposal is considered to comply with Policy BE1.

Impact on the character and setting of the Listed Building

Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 imposes a duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting when considering whether to grant a planning permission which affects a listed building or its setting.

Paragraph 132 of the NPPF states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.

Warwick District Local Plan Policy HE1 (protection of statutory heritage assets) states that permission will not be granted to alter or extend a listed building where those works will adversely affect its special architectural or historic interest, integrity, or setting.

The proposal has been assessed by the Conservation Officer who notes that the existing garage is very subservient to the principal listed building (the main house). The extension proposed would result in a level of footprint not too dissimilar to that of the farmhouse which would diminish its subservient appearance and introduce a feature that competes with the Listed Building and would have a detrimental impact on its setting.

In addition, the construction of more built form on the site presents a greater sense of urbanisation of a rural site, which traditionally and historically has always been open countryside, causing harm to the setting of the listed building.

For the above reasons, the proposal is considered to represent harm to the setting of the Listed Building. In assessing this proposal, Officers consider that the harm is less than substantial. However, there are considered to be no public benefits that would outweigh the identified harm and the proposal is therefore contrary to Policy HE1 of the Local Plan and national guidance contained within the NPPF.

Impact on adjacent properties

Policy BE3 of the Warwick District Local Plan states that new development will not be permitted that has an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenity of nearby uses and residents.

There are no near neighbours that would be affected by the proposed development.

Highway Safety

Policy TR1 of the Warwick District Local Plan requires all developments provide safe, suitable and attractive access routes for all users that are not detrimental to highway safety. Policy TR3 requires all development proposals to make adequate provision for parking for all users of a site in accordance with the relevant parking standards.

There are no elements of the proposed development that would affect highway safety associated with the site.

Impact on Ecology/Protected Species

Policy NE3 of the Warwick District Local Plan states that development proposals will be expected to protect, enhance and/or restore habitat biodiversity and where this is not possible, mitigation or compensatory measures should be identified accordingly.

The County Ecologist has assessed the proposal and advised that the Warwickshire Biological Records Centre holds bat records (including of roosting bats) nearby and the site is near to good habitat for foraging and commuting bats. In light of this, the Ecologist considers that the garage may support crevice-dwelling bat species.

The Ecologist has concluded that it would be possible to secure conditions to ensure that all works are carried out carried out under the supervision of a qualified bat ecologist to ensure that protected species are not harmed by the development in order to comply with Policy NE3.

Conclusion

The proposal represents the extension of a building within the Green Belt that equates to an increase of approximately 160% over the floor area of the original building. This is considered to represent a disproportionate addition which is harmful by definition and by reason of harm to openness. There are considered to be no very special circumstances which exist that would outweigh the harm identified.

The proposal is also considered to harm the setting of the Listed Building through the creation of a substantial increase in the built form of the outbuilding that would diminish the subservient nature of the existing building and compete for dominance within the site. The proposal is considered to amount to less than substantial harm but there are no public benefits which outweigh this harm.

For the above reasons, the application is recommended for refusal.

REFUSAL REASONS

1 In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposed development represents a disproportionate addition to the original building and therefore constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt which is harmful by definition and by reason of harm to openness. No very special circumstances are considered to exist which outweigh the harm identified.

The proposed development is therefore contrary to the National Policy Framework and to Policy DS18 of the Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029.

2 The proposed extension would result in an oversized ancillary building which would diminish the subservient appearance of the existing detached garage and introduce a dominant feature that would compete with the main Listed Building and would therefore have a detrimental impact upon its setting.

In addition, the construction of more built form on the site presents a greater sense of urbanisation of a rural site, which traditionally and historically has always been open countryside, causing harm to the setting of the listed building.

For the above reasons, the proposal is considered to represent harm to the setting of the Listed Building. The proposal results in less than substantial harm but there are considered to be public benefits that would outweigh the identified harm and the proposal is therefore contrary to Policy HE1 of the Local Plan and national guidance contained within the NPPF.