

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 16 DECEMBER 2021

PART - DELEGATED

11. **21/2247/FUL – First floor front and rear extensions, loft conversion including increase in ridge height, dormer windows and rooflights, construction of front porch, alterations to external materials and alterations to fenestration at CRESTYL, DIMMOCKS LANE, SARRATT, WD3 6AR**

Parish: Sarratt Parish Council
Expiry of Statutory Period: 22.11.2021

Ward: Chorleywood North & Sarratt
Case Officer: Tom Norris

Recommendation: That Planning Permission be Refused.

Reason for consideration by the Committee: Called in by Sarratt Parish Council unless Officers are minded to approve.

1 Planning History

- 1.1 20/2442/PDT - Prior approval: Enlargement of the dwellinghouse by the construction of one additional storey (2.74m in height) to result in an overall height of 8.14m (Class AA) - 08.01.2021 – Permitted, not implemented
- 1.2 20/1681/FUL - First floor front and rear extensions, loft conversion including increase in ridge height, dormer windows and rooflights, construction of front porch, alterations to external materials and alterations to fenestration - 12.10.2020 – **Refused & Appeal Dismissed January 2021:**
- R1 The proposed extensions to the dwelling, considered in conjunction with existing extensions, would result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building and would increase its visual prominence and apparent bulk at roof level. The proposal therefore would represent an inappropriate form of development and would result in actual harm to the openness of the Green Belt. It is considered that very special circumstances do not exist to outweigh the harm of the development to the Green Belt by virtue of its inappropriateness and actual harm. As such the proposal is contrary to Policy CP11 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011), Policy DM2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013) and the NPPF.*
- 1.3 19/1716/FUL - Two storey side and rear extension, alterations to roof form including increase in ridge height and the provision of front, side and rear dormer windows, rear rooflights, front porch, alterations to fenestration detail and alterations to external materials. - 18.10.2019 – Withdrawn
- 1.4 15/2431/FUL - Conversion of garage into habitable accommodation and loft conversion to include rooflights to front and rear - 22.01.2016 – Permitted
- 1.5 95/0126 - Single storey side and rear extension - 10.05.1995
- 1.6 8/673/91 - Single storey side extension - 09.12.1991
- 1.7 W/4952/73 - House & Garage Adjoining - 28.01.1974
- 1.8 W/590/48 - Garage & Outhouse - 08.02.1949
- 1.9 W/45/48 - Bungalow - 29.09.1948

2 Description of Application Site

- 2.1 The application site is located on the eastern side of Dimmocks Lane, Sarratt and measures approximately 1900sqm in area. The application site contains a bungalow that is set some 18m into the plot from the public highway. The dwelling has dark tiled hipped roof forms and a red facing brick exterior and has implemented side and rear extensions which include extensions to the main roof form.
- 2.2 Forward of the dwelling is a large front garden and gravel driveway and to the rear of the dwelling is an amenity garden of approximately 800sqm in area which is laid as lawn and contains a swimming pool.
- 2.3 The immediate context consists predominantly of bungalows although there are examples of two-storey dwellings in the vicinity. The immediately adjoining neighbours to the north and south are bungalows.
- 2.4 The site is within the Metropolitan Green Belt.

3 Description of Proposed Development

- 3.1 This application seeks planning permission for a first floor front and rear extension, loft conversion including increase in ridge height, dormer windows and rooflights, construction of front porch, alterations to external materials and alterations to fenestration.
- 3.2 This application is an identical proposal to one which was refused and subsequently dismissed at appeal (20/1681/FUL). This previous application was refused on the grounds of its impact upon the Metropolitan Green Belt. The full reason for refusal is set out in the Planning History section of this report. This view was supported by The Planning Inspectorate who dismissed the appeal. The only change in site circumstances since the previous application is the grant of 20/2442/PDT for the enlargement of the dwellinghouse by the construction of one additional storey.
- 3.3 The existing hipped roof to the dwelling would be removed and a new roof constructed to facilitate a loft conversion. The existing eaves height of the dwelling would be increased by 0.6m whilst the dwelling would be subject to a maximum overall ridge height increase of 0.9m. The new roof would also have roofslopes set at a steeper angle in comparison to the existing.
- 3.4 The roof would be extended forward by approximately 3.5m to form two gable ends, each of a width of 5.5m, to the section of the dwelling set furthest forward. A gable end of the same scale would be constructed to the rear. The gables in the front and rear would contain full height glazing at ground floor level and full height glazing at first floor which would follow the triangular line of the eaves.
- 3.5 Two dormer windows would be inserted within the new front roofslope of the set-back section of the dwelling. The dormer windows would have pitched roof forms and would be set up to the ridge with a depth of 2.2m, a width of 2.6m and a height of 2.2m. There would be sets of three-casement rooflights within each flank roofslope. Within the rear roofslope there would be two sets of full height rooflights, one containing five casements and the other containing three. There would be sets of sliding doors and windows inserted within the rear elevation of the dwelling.
- 3.6 A front porch would be built to the main front entrance door to the dwelling which would have a depth of 2.2m, a width of 4.1m, an eaves height of 2.6m and an overall height of 3.1m.
- 3.7 Photovoltaics would be positioned within the flat section of the proposed new roof form. These would protrude some 0.5m from the flat section of roof although would not exceed the maximum overall roof height.

- 3.8 The external materials of the dwelling would be altered to include predominantly white render to the external walls with sections of timber cladding. The windows would be metal framed and the new roof would be finished with grey tiles.

4 Consultation

4.1 Statutory Consultation

4.1.1 Sarratt Parish Council:

"No objection. We request the application is called into Committee if the Planning Officer is minded to refuse this application."

4.1.2 Hertfordshire Ecology: [Objection]

"The application site comprises a large 1940s dwellinghouse (bungalow) with integrated garage. It has been extended several times up to 1995 and consequently has a large complex roof. It is situated in an area of low-density housing with plenty of mature trees nearby, as well as grasslands and fields within 130m -160m in all directions. There are records of roosting bats in the area.

Bats are protected under European and national legislation and in general terms, it is an offence to disturb or harm a bat, or damage or obstruct access to a roost. They will roost in buildings (often underneath loose tiles or lifted weatherboarding, or in gaps/cracks in the fabric of a building), as well as in trees, if suitable features and conditions are available.

The proposals involve significant modification to the roof. Habitat connectivity is good and if bats are present, they are likely to be affected. I believe it is reasonable to advise a daytime Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) is undertaken by an appropriately qualified and experienced ecologist to evaluate whether bats, or evidence of them, are present and will be affected by the proposals. Such surveys can be undertaken at any time of year but should follow established best practice as described in the Bat Conservation Trust Good Practice Guidelines, 3rd edition, 2016.

If bats or roosts will be affected by this proposal, appropriate mitigation and compensation will be needed to safeguard bats and ensure their continued ecological functionality. A protected species mitigation licence (issued by Natural England) will be required to proceed lawfully and I have no reason to believe a licence will not be issued.

As bats are classified as European Protected Species (EPS) sufficient information is required to be submitted to the LPA prior to determination - to enable it to consider the impact of the proposal on bats and discharges its legal obligations under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended). Consequently, in the event that evidence of bats or potential for them is found during the PRA, further (emergence / reentry) surveys will be required which can only be carried out when bats are active in the summer months between May and August, or September if the weather remains warm.

As we are outside the bat activity survey season, a brief 'Outline Mitigation and Compensation Strategy' with appropriate recommendations should be included within the PRA bat report if the LPA is to adequately consider the impact of the proposal on bats in the off-season. This strategy should assume the presence of a bat roost proportionate to the location and can be modified if necessary once the results of any recommended follow-up activity survey are known. In this situation only, i.e. once an outline mitigation and compensation strategy has been submitted and approved, would I advise any outstanding surveys can be secured by Condition."

4.1.3 Herts & Middlesex Wildlife Trust: [No response received]

4.1.4 National Grid (Gas): [No response received]

4.2 Public/Neighbour Consultation

4.2.1 Neighbours consulted: 9

4.2.2 Responses received: 0

4.2.3 Site notice not required.

4.2.4 Press notice not required.

5 Reason for Delay

5.1 Committee cycle.

6 Relevant Planning Policy, Guidance and Legislation

6.1 National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance

In July 2021 the new National Planning Policy Framework was published. This is read alongside the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG). The determination of planning applications is made mindful of Central Government advice and the Local Plan for the area. It is recognised that Local Planning Authorities must determine applications in accordance with the statutory Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise, and that the planning system does not exist to protect the private interests of one person against another. 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 states that 'good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities'. 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.

6.2 The Three Rivers Local 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 of the adopted Core Strategy include CP1, 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 of the adopted Development Management Policies LDD include DM1, DM2, DM6, DM12, DM13 and Appendices 2 and 5.

6.3 Other

Extensions to Dwellings in the Green Belt Supplementary Planning Guidance

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

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.

7 Planning Analysis

7.1 Impact on the Metropolitan Green Belt

7.1.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open and that the essential characteristics of Green Belt are their openness and their permanence. One of the purposes of including land within Green Belt is to safeguard the countryside from encroachment.

7.1.2 The NPPF identifies the five purposes of including land in Green Belts as:

- to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another;
- to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land

7.1.3 Paragraph 145 of the NPPF indicates that the construction of new buildings within the Green Belt should be regarded as inappropriate; inappropriate development in the Green Belt is, by definition harmful. However, 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, is listed as one of the exceptions to inappropriate development as set out within the NPPF.

7.1.4 Policy CP11 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) 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.

7.1.5 Policy DM2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013) 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. This policy post-dates the 2012 NPPF, and the wording of national Green Belt policy has not materially changed in the most recent NPPF and therefore DM2 is considered consistent with national Green Belt policy and thus can be given weight.

7.1.6 The 'Extensions to Dwellings in the Green Belt Supplementary Planning Guidance' provides further explanation of the interpretation of the 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.

- 7.1.7 The application site contains a bungalow that has undergone a number of extensions since its original construction. The below table sets out a comparison between the original dwelling and the dwelling as it exists with its current extensions.

	Original dwelling	Existing dwelling
Max. overall height	5.1m	5.1m (no increase)
Max. ground floor width	9.5m	20.5m (116% increase)
Max. ground floor depth	14m	18.5m (32% increase)
Ground floor floorspace	85m ²	230m ² (171% increase)
First floor floorspace	-	-
Total floorspace	85m ²	230m ² (171% increase)
Footprint	100m ²	255m ² (155% increase)

- 7.1.8 It is clear from the above table that the existing extensions to the dwelling already constitute what may be deemed disproportionate additions to the original building given that they far exceed the 40% guidance which is generally considered proportionate. In some instances, including ground floor width, floorspace and footprint, the extensions have nearly doubled the scale of the dwelling from its original form.
- 7.1.9 The extensions proposed under this application would represent a further increase to the scale of the dwelling over and above what may be considered proportionate. The application dwelling would be subject to an increase in height of 0.9m which would introduce an additional 160sqm of internal floorspace at roof level. The proposal however does not include any increase in terms of the ground floor floorspace and footprint of the dwelling. Given the above it is considered that the proposal would result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building.
- 7.1.10 The overall impact to the openness of the Metropolitan Green Belt and actual harm to openness is also a material consideration and any assessment does not rely solely upon material indicators therefore it is appropriate to also make a visual assessment.
- 7.1.11 As was considered in the refusal of 20/1681/FUL, which was an identical scheme, from all angles, the extended dwelling is considered to be perceptibly larger and more bulky than the original building. The proposed enlarged roof form would be discernibly higher and the incorporation of gable ended roof forms and two large expanses of crown roof form are considered to add to the significantly more bulky appearance of the extended dwelling. The proposed roof forms would exacerbate the disproportionate nature of the proposed development. In addition, the significant quantity of full height glazing from ground to first floor level, and the introduction of a significant amount of loft fenestration including dormer windows and rooflights, would make the dwelling appear significantly larger. It is therefore considered that the proposed extensions would not only be wholly disproportionate to the original building but they would result in visual harm to the openness of the Metropolitan Green Belt. No conflict with any of the purposes of the Green Belt is considered to arise.
- 7.1.12 An appeal against the refusal of the above application was dismissed on 25 January 2021 (APP/P1940/D/20/3263069). In this appeal the Inspector concurred with the Green Belt assessment of the LPA and concluded that *the appeal proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which would, by definition, be harmful to the Green Belt. It would also cause harm to the openness of the Green Belt.* The Inspector further concluded that *the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development do not exist.* This current application is accompanied by a Design Statement which puts forward circumstances since the refusal of the previous permission and dismissal of the appeal which the applicant wishes to be considered alongside this scheme. Those matters are considered in the Very Special Circumstances section later in this report.

7.1.13 In summary, the proposed extensions to the dwelling, considered in conjunction with existing extensions to the dwelling, would be disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building and, by virtue of the increased loft level bulk and increased height, would increase the prominence of the building. The proposal therefore does not fall within any of the exceptions within paragraph 149 of the NPPF and conflicts with Policy DM2. As such, it would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt in addition to resulting in actual harm to openness.. Furthermore, an identical scheme was dismissed at appeal in 2021 and it is not considered that the site circumstances or the development plan have changed since to the extent that a different conclusion could be reached in this regard.

7.2 Impact on the Character & Appearance of the Area

7.2.1 Policy CP1 of the Core Strategy seeks to support 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'.

7.2.2 Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies document set out that development should not have a significant impact on the visual amenities of an area and that extensions should not be excessively prominent in relation to the general street scene and respect the existing character of the dwelling, particularly with regard to the roof form, positioning and style of windows and doors, and materials. The Design Criteria at Appendix 2 states that crown roofs can exacerbate the bulk and mass of properties and are generally discouraged in favour of more traditional pitched roof forms and that dormer windows should be subordinate to the host roof slope, set down from the main ridge, in from the flanks and up from the plane of the rear wall.

7.2.3 As was considered in the refusal of 20/1681/FUL, the application dwelling would adopt a contrasting appearance to that which exists currently and would appear more as a more modern and contemporary dwelling in terms of its external finish materials and introduction of additional glazing. Given the general variance of the street scene, it is considered that the proposal to alter the external materials of the dwelling to include light render, grey framed windows and a grey slate roof would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling or area. The application dwelling is spaced a relatively substantial distance from each neighbour therefore the proposed increase in ridge height is not considered to result in significant harm to the street scene which does vary somewhat.

7.2.4 Whilst the proposed development is not considered to result in harm to the character and appearance of the area by virtue of its general design and finish, it does not serve to overcome the harm to the Green Belt identified within the previous section of this report.

7.2.5 The proposed development is therefore acceptable in accordance with of Policies CP1 and CP12 of Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the DMP LDD (adopted July 2013).

7.3 Impact on the 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'.

7.3.2 The proposed development would not extend the footprint of the existing dwelling however its overall height and roof bulk would be increased as a result of the proposed development. Given the position of the application dwelling relative to neighbours, it is not considered that the proposed development would lead to a loss of light or have an overbearing impact detrimental to any neighbouring amenity.

7.3.3 The proposed development would introduce glazing at loft level facing rearwards, forwards and to each flank. It is considered appropriate to condition the flank glazing to be conditioned to be obscure glazed and it is not considered that the front loft level glazing would lead to any unacceptable overlooking. Given the orientation of the plots to the flank and the rear, the proposed development would lead to a degree of overlooking to the neighbours to the rear however, given that the area consists largely of bungalows, there is an inherent degree of overlooking through the introduction of loft level glazing. On balance it is not considered that the proposed rear glazing at loft level would lead to detrimental harm to neighbouring amenity to justify the refusal of planning permission.

7.3.4 In summary, the proposed development would not result in an adverse impact on the residential amenity of any neighbouring dwelling and the development would therefore be acceptable in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy.

7.4 Highways & Parking

7.4.1 Policy CP10 of the Core Strategy requires development to demonstrate that it will provide a safe and adequate means of access. Policy DM13 and Appendix 5 of the Development Management Policies LDD advises on off street car parking requirements. Appendix 5 sets out that a 4 or more bedroom dwelling should provide three parking spaces.

7.4.2 The application dwelling would retain a driveway large enough to accommodate at least three parking spaces which would meet the adopted standards. The access to the site would remain as existing.

7.4.3 The proposed development would accord with Policy CP10 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM13 and Appendix 5 of the Development Management Policies document (adopted July 2013).

7.5 Rear Garden Amenity Space

7.5.1 Policy CP12 of the Core Strategy states that development should take into account the need for adequate levels and disposition of privacy, prospect, amenity and garden space Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies Document states that 'amenity space must be provided within the curtilage of all new residential developments.'

7.5.2 The application site would retain a rear amenity space of over 700 sqm following the implementation of the proposed extensions.

7.5.3 The proposed development would accord with Policy CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies document (adopted July 2013).

7.6 Trees & Landscape

7.6.1 Policy CP12 of the Core Strategy expects development proposals to 'have regard to the character, amenities and quality of an area', to 'conserve and enhance natural and heritage assets' and to 'ensure the development is adequately landscaped and is designed to retain, enhance or improve important existing natural features.' Policy DM6 of the Development Management Policies LDD advises that 'development proposals should demonstrate that existing trees, hedgerows and woodlands will be safeguarded and managed during and after development in accordance with the relevant British Standard.

7.6.2 The proposal would not require the removal or result in any harm to trees.

7.6.3 The proposed development would accord with Policy CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM6 of the Development Management Policies document (adopted July 2013).

7.7 Biodiversity

- 7.7.1 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.
- 7.7.2 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 document. 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. A Biodiversity Checklist was submitted with the application and states that no protected species or biodiversity interests will be affected as a result of the application.
- 7.7.3 As the proposed works would impact the roof of the dwelling, Hertfordshire Ecology raised an objection to the proposed development, stating that a Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment should be carried out prior to the determination of any application. In the absence of such a survey this would form a reason for refusal of the application.

7.8 Do Very Special Circumstances exist?

- 7.8.1 It has been demonstrated that the proposed development would be inappropriate by definition and would also result in harm to the Metropolitan Green Belt. It has also not been demonstrated that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on any protected species, in this instance Bats, which may be present within or use the site. As per paragraph 148 of the NPPF any harm identified to the Green Belt should be given substantial weight.
- 7.8.2 The Design and Access statement submitted with the application contends that the proposed development would have significantly less impact on the Green Belt than the Prior Approval permission (20/2442/PDT) for the *enlargement of the dwellinghouse by the construction of one additional storey (2.74m in height)*. It is noted that this prior approval has been granted but has not been implemented. The applicant sets out that the Prior Approval scheme would result in an additional 23m³ volume when compared to the current proposals. In addition, the applicant sets out that the surface area of the front elevation of the prior approval scheme would be 11.7m² larger than the current application scheme.
- 7.8.3 In terms of the contended fall-back position, case law has established that there needs to be a reasonable likelihood that a fall-back position would be implemented for it to be a material consideration. The LPA is of the view that the fall-back position produces a reasonably functional and practical layout that would ultimately achieve a larger dwelling should the current application proposal be refused. Notwithstanding, it is acknowledged that the development proposed under this application is identical to that previously refused and dismissed at Appeal before the Prior Approval scheme was granted permission. In the first instance, the LPA consider that this diminishes the likelihood that there is even an intention to implement the Prior Approval permission.
- 7.8.4 It is also important to assess whether the fall-back position would have a greater impact on the Green Belt than the proposed development. It is noted that there would be some volumetric and front elevational saving between the Prior Approval and the application proposal however this would be only a 2% saving and an 11% saving respectively. The LPA therefore consider that there would not be significant betterment to the Green Belt as a result of the application proposal, particularly when factoring in the small likelihood that the fall-back position would ever be implemented. Furthermore, when granting the PDT application, the LPA considered that the proposed additional storey was fairly central within

the context of the ground floor and retained significant spacing to the flanks. In addition, the PDT scheme did not comprise a number of prominent gable features, dormer windows and ground to eaves level glazing, which further emphasises the height.

	Total Volume of dwelling	Front Elevation of dwelling
20/2442/PDT	1328m³ (25% increase)	122m² (21% increase)
21/2247/FUL	1305m³ (23% increase)	111m² (10% increase)

7.8.5 In summary, whilst weight is given to the possible fallback position, it is not considered that the weight given tips the balance and outweighs the substantial harm to the Green Belt. As such, it is not considered that the material considerations in favour of the proposal constitute Very Special Circumstances. The development therefore remains inappropriate development and harms openness.

8 Recommendation

8.1 That PLANNING PERMISSION BE REFUSED for the following reasons:

- R1 The proposed extensions to the dwelling, considered in conjunction with existing extensions, would result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building and would increase its visual prominence and apparent bulk at roof level. The proposal therefore would represent an inappropriate form of development and would result in actual harm to the openness of the Green Belt. Whilst acknowledging the fallback position as a material consideration in favour of the development, it is not considered that it outweighs the harm to the Green Belt by virtue of its inappropriateness and actual harm. As such no very special circumstances has been demonstrated. The development is contrary to Policy CP11 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011), Policy DM2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013) and the NPPF (2021).
- R2 In the absence of sufficient information, it has not been demonstrated that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on any protected species which may be present within or use the site. Therefore necessary consideration and appropriate mitigation cannot be given to the impact of the development on protected species or their habitats contrary to Policies CP1 and CP9 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM6 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

Informative

- I1 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 has considered, in a positive and proactive manner, whether the planning objections to this proposal could be satisfactorily resolved within the statutory period for determining the application. Whilst the applicant and/or their agent and the Local Planning Authority engaged in pre-application discussions, 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.