

Ryarsh **566516 160282** **7 September 2015** **TM/15/02814/FL**
Downs And Mereworth

Proposal: Two storey side and rear extension
Location: Fishpond Cottage Chapel Street Ryarsh West Malling Kent
 ME19 5JU
Applicant: Mrs Katy Nunn

1. Description:

- 1.1 This application seeks planning permission for a two storey 'L'-shaped side and rear extension that will wrap around the existing building. The existing single storey side entrance is to be demolished with the proposed two storey extension projecting a further 4.4 metres from the side wall of the dwelling.
- 1.2 The dwelling is currently a four bedroomed 1 bathroom property. The proposal will result in a six bedroomed (one with en-suite) and 1 bathroom dwelling.

2. Reason for reporting to Committee:

- 2.1 At the request of Cllr Balfour in order to consider the application of Green Belt policy in this particular case.

3. The Site:

- 3.1 The application site lies outside the village confines, within open countryside, the Metropolitan Green Belt and an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The dwelling is a detached building located within a spacious plot. Planning permission was granted for a two storey rear extension in 1949 with an amendment to this for a first floor enlargement granted in 1950.
- 3.2 Workhorse Road borders the site to the west with access to the site gained from Chapel Street to the east. The site borders agricultural land to the south with the nearest residential property being Heavers House to the north east.

4. Planning History (relevant):

TM/49/10218/OLD grant with conditions 22 September 1949

Addition of Bedroom and kitchen to Fishpond Cottage.

TM/50/10299/OLD grant with conditions 25 May 1950

Additions of bathroom, kitchen etc.

TM/64/10764/OLD Refuse 20 February 1964

Erection of two dwellings, garages and vehicular accesses.

TM/72/10728/OLD grant with conditions 10 August 1972

Store and garage.

TM/14/01039/FL Refuse 9 May 2014

Two storey side and rear extension

5. Consultees:

5.1 PC: No objection to the application.

5.2 Private Reps (2/0S/0R/0X + Site notice): No representations received.

6. Determining Issues:

6.1 The application site lies within the Green Belt and therefore Section 9 of the NPPF applies. Paragraph 89 states that the construction of new buildings should be regarded as inappropriate in the Green Belt. However, there are exceptions and one of these includes the extension or alteration of an existing building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. Policy CP3 of the TMBCS requires proposed development within the Green Belt to comply with National Policy.

6.2 For the purpose of making an assessment into whether the proposed extension to the building would be a proportionate addition it must be considered against the size of the original building (as it stood in 1948). Since that time the two storey rear extension has been added to the building (granted permission in 1949/1950). As such, the extension now proposed must be viewed cumulatively with that previous extension, irrespective of the amount of time it has remained in situ.

6.3 The proposed extensions in addition to those previously constructed would effectively double the size of the original dwellinghouse in terms of footprint. Furthermore, there would be a substantial increase in bulk arising from the two storey addition proposed. I therefore consider that the extensions would amount to a disproportionate addition to the original building, therefore constituting inappropriate development which is harmful by definition and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

6.4 Furthermore, I consider that the particular siting and scale of the extensions, combined with the open character of the site itself, would cause harm to the open nature of the Green Belt at this point.

- 6.5 Paragraph 87 of the NPPF sets out that 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 the harm to the Green Belt (as identified above in this case) is clearly outweighed by other considerations. This is a high threshold to overcome and I can find no very special circumstances that exist in this case to outweigh the identified harm to the Green Belt.
- 6.6 Paragraph 115 of the NPPF requires weight to be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. Policy CP7 of the TMBCS states that development will not be permitted which would be detrimental to the natural beauty and quiet enjoyment of the AONB. The design of the proposal is such that I do not consider that it would have an adverse impact on the AONB.
- 6.7 More generally, policy CP24 of the TMBCS requires all development proposals to be well designed and of a high quality. It also requires proposals to be designed to respect the site and its surroundings in terms of scale, layout, siting, character and appearance and safety of the area. Notwithstanding the issues discussed above, the extensions themselves when viewed as a standalone development would not cause any visual harm to the appearance of the building itself. Equally, the separation that exists between the cottage and its nearest neighbours would ensure that there would be no impact to residential amenity arising from the proposed development.
- 6.8 These factors however do not amount to very special circumstances in terms of overriding the principle objection to the development in Green Belt terms.
- 6.9 It should also be noted that the site is located outside the village confines and therefore the development should be assessed against policy CP14 of the TMBCS. Policy CP14 sets out to restrict inappropriate development in the countryside but allows for the appropriate extension to an existing dwellinghouse. It also states that within the Green Belt inappropriate development which is otherwise acceptable within the terms of policy CP14 must still be justified by very special circumstances. For the reasons given above, I do not consider this to be the case in this instance.
- 6.10 In conclusion, the proposed development is inappropriate by definition and would cause material harm to the openness of the Green Belt. No very special circumstances have been identified to outweigh that harm and as such I therefore recommend that planning permission be refused.

7. Recommendation:

- 7.1 **Refuse planning permission** for the following reason:

Reason

- 1 The site lies within the Metropolitan Green Belt where there is a strong presumption against permitting inappropriate development, as defined in Paragraph 89 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012. The proposed extension when viewed cumulatively with previous additions to the building would be disproportionate in size to the original dwelling and therefore constitutes inappropriate development which is harmful by definition to the Green Belt. The extension by virtue of its overall size and specific siting would also cause material harm to the openness Green Belt. No very special circumstances exist that outweigh the identified harm to the Green Belt. The proposed development is therefore contrary to the requirements of Paragraphs 87 and 89 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and policy CP3 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Core Strategy 2007.

Contact: Paul Batchelor