

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

28th March 2012

**APPEAL OUTCOME –
WOODSILL COTTAGE, WEAVERS HILL, HUNT END**

APPEAL MADE AGAINST REFUSAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION

PLANNING APPLICATION DETAILS: 2011/277/FUL

PROPOSAL	EXTENSIONS TO DWELLING
LOCATION	WOODSILL COTTAGE, WEAVERS HILL, HUNT END, REDDITCH
WARD	ASTWOOD BANK & FECKENHAM
DECISION	DECISION MADE BY OFFICERS UNDER DELEGATED POWERS 16TH NOVEMBER 2011

The author of this report is Steven Edden, Planning Officer (DM), who can be contacted on extension 3206 (e-mail: steve.edden@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk) for more information.

Discussion

The case related to the proposed extension of a detached cottage located within the Green Belt. The planning application was refused for the following reason:

1. The scale of the proposed extension both side and rear, by virtue of its size and design would have a dominating and adverse effect on the original design, character and appearance of the existing cottage and would result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. As such, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy D.39 of the Worcestershire Structure Plan, Policy B(RA).1 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No. 3 and national guidance set out in Planning Policy Guidance Note 2 'Green Belts'

Officers sought to defend that reason through written representations to the Planning Inspector.

The Inspector, like Officers, noted that the property had been extended significantly in the past by the addition of a conservatory and a two storey extension. When taken together, by floorspace and volume, the Inspector considered that the existing and proposed extensions would amount to a disproportionate addition to the original property and accordingly, the Inspector concluded that the proposals would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt being contrary to PPG2, Policy D.39 of the Worcestershire Structure Plan and Local Plan Policy B(RA).1.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

28th March 2012

The Inspector considered that the two storey extension proposed, sited to the side of the cottage would be visible from the road and due to the property's elevated position would be visually conspicuous and would have an adverse effect on the openness of the Green Belt. The *very special circumstances* required to justify the development under the terms of PPG2 were not considered to exist in this case.

Appeal outcome

The planning appeal was DISMISSED. Costs were neither sought nor awarded.

Further issues

None.

Recommendation

**The Committee is asked to RESOLVE that
the item of information be noted.**