

Date of Meeting	08 March 2017
Application Number	16/12097/FUL
Site Address	Tisbut House, Box Hill, Corsham, Wiltshire SN13 8HG
Proposal	First Floor Extension Built Over an Existing Flat Roof Projection
Applicant	Mr Daniel O'Hara
Town/Parish Council	BOX
Electoral Division	CORSHAM WITHOUT AND BOX HILL – Councillor Dick Tonge
Grid Ref	383556 169457
Type of Application	Full Planning
Case Officer	Catherine Jackson

Reason for the application being considered by Committee:

The application has been called to Committee by the Local Member, Councillor Dick Tonge, in order *'To enable Members of the Committee to consider how little impact this modest proposal has and how it improves the existing dwelling.'*

1. Purpose of Report

The purpose of the report is to assess the merits of the proposal against the policies of the development plan and other material considerations and to consider the recommendation that the application be refused.

2. Report Summary

The main issues in the consideration of the above application are as follows:

- The principle of the development.
- The impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the application site and the surrounding Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
- The impact of the proposal on the openness of the Western Wiltshire Green Belt.
- The impact of the proposal on the residential amenities of surrounding properties.

An objection has been received from the Box Parish Council with regard to the application. In addition, one representation from a nearby resident has been received and provides support for the application.

3. Site Description

Tisbut House is a detached two-storey dwelling occupying a substantial plot just outside Box village. In planning terms the site is located in open countryside and is also situated within the Western Wiltshire Green Belt and Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

The property has been extended in the past with a mixture of single and two storey extensions. The planning history indicates that the majority of the extensions were undertaken during the 1970s and 1980s and benefitted from planning permission. No records are available for a single storey element to the south east of the property or for the existing conservatory. To the rear of the property are several large outbuildings which

provide a combination of garaging and storage. A stone wall borders the site and there is vehicular access off Maslen Lane which leads to a gravel and concrete hard standing parking area.

4. Planning History

15/00168/FUL	Refurbishment, Remodelling and First Floor Extension to Dwelling, Demolition of Outbuildings and Landscape Works	Withdrawn
16/05008/FUL	Proposed Removal of Outbuildings & Extensions, Replacement Extension and Resiting of Outbuildings	Approved July 2016

5. The Proposal

This application seeks permission for a first floor extension built over an existing flat roof projection.

Although not yet built, a substantive amount of the development shown on the proposed plans has previously been approved under Planning Permission 16/05008/FUL, the exception being the first floor extension over the existing balcony. This planning application sought to rationalise the existing arrangement of the dwelling. The plans proposed a new extension to the rear, replacing a series of lean-to elements as well as a further extension over the existing balcony. The existing conservatory and an earlier single storey addition to the south elevation would be demolished. It was also intended to demolish the existing outbuildings and to erect a new three bay garage and workshop closer to the north-east boundary of the site. That previous permission remains extant.

Prior to the determination of the previous application (16/05008/FUL) the Applicant and the Council worked closely together to achieve a suitable scheme. During the negotiations, it was specifically requested by the Council that the first floor extension over the existing balcony be omitted from the scheme as it was considered to, along with previous extensions to the property, result in a disproportionate addition.

The application now seeks to reintroduce this element back into the scheme.

6. Local Planning Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF):
Paragraphs 14 and 17; Sections 7, 9 and 11

Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS):

Core Policy 51 – Landscape

Core Policy 57 – Ensuring High Quality Design and Place Shaping

7. Summary of consultation responses

Box Parish Council – *‘Objections. This is contrary to Green Belt policy as the original building has already been increased in excess of 50%.’*

8. Publicity

The application was advertised by site notice and direct neighbour notification letter. One letter of support was received from a nearby resident.

9. Planning Considerations

Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 require that the determination of planning applications

must be made in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Principle:

The use of the site for residential purposes is well established. The application involves the extension and alterations to an existing dwelling of which Core Policy 57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy is permissive of.

In addition, Green Belt Policy contained within the NPPF is permissive of the extension or alteration to an existing building.

Character and Appearance:

The property has been significantly extended with various additions over time and this has resulted in an awkward and untidy arrangement of projections to the rear. The previously approved application rationalises this mixture of development and is considered a welcome improvement. The simple contemporary design approach in this case is considered to compliment the more traditional character of the original house. The combination of contemporary and traditional matching materials would ensure the extensions integrate sufficiently with the original house and surrounding area. It is considered that the proposed first floor extension would not adversely impact upon the character and appearance of the application site and relates well to the overall improvement of the property previously approved.

The extension would well contained within the application site and continues the style and design of the previously approved scheme. Therefore, the impact of the extension on the character and appearance of the wider area is considered minimal.

AONB:

The proposal is located within the Cotswolds AONB; consequently, there is a requirement to ensure that the development does not have a detrimental impact on the natural beauty of the landscape. As the proposal is well contained within the application site, uses materials that harmonize with the existing dwelling and landscape, is positioned within the setting of existing built form and is associated with an existing dwelling, it is considered that the extension would have limited impacts upon the natural beauty of the wider area.

Green Belt:

With regard to the Green Belt, the NPPF explains that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt.

The NPPF indicates that the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt is inappropriate, however Paragraph 89 is permissive of *'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.'* The NPPF does not quantify what is meant by disproportionate and the Wiltshire Core Strategy does not contain its own Green Belt Policy. Therefore, each application is determined on its own merits. In addition Paragraph 90 of the NPPF is permissive of the replacement of a building providing the replacement building is in the same use and not materially larger.

Previous extensions to the property have resulted in a substantial increase in volume over that of the existing dwelling, approximately in the region of a 50% increase. The extensions approved under Application 16/05008/FUL would not result in an additional volume increase due to the removal of the existing lean-to elements, and as such were therefore considered acceptable. Whilst the first floor extension now proposed is relatively limited in its own right

(approximately amounting to somewhere in the region of a 4% increase over that approved situation), it must be viewed within the context of the expressly negotiated position agreed with the applicant under 16/05008/FUL, where that first floor extension was omitted. Cumulatively, the proposed first floor extension is considered to represent disproportionate additions to the size of the original dwelling.

Permission 16/05008/FUL secures a scheme which is considered to result in no harm to the Green Belt. That permission is live and could be implemented at any time and is therefore a realistic fall back position. In addition, there are no special circumstances to outweigh the harm caused to the Green Belt by the addition of a further extension to the property which has already been significantly extended.

Residential Amenity:

The proposal would not result in any significant additional levels of overlooking and would not result in any loss of light nor would it have an overbearing impact on neighbouring properties. In terms of the impact of the proposal on the residential amenities of surrounding properties, the application is regarded as acceptable.

Highway Safety/Car Parking:

The proposed first floor extension would increase the size of the master bedroom. The property would accommodate five bedrooms. In accordance with Wiltshire Council Car Parking Requirements, at least three car parking spaces are required for a property of this size. A new outbuilding would be erected providing space for three cars and an additional parking and turning area would also be created close to the property. This is considered acceptable.

10. Conclusion

The proposed development is not in accordance with the relevant planning policy as highlighted above as it would result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original dwelling. In the absence of any overriding public benefit or exceptional circumstances, it is recommended that the application be refused.

RECOMMENDATION:

That planning permission is REFUSED, for the following reason:

- 1 The proposal amounts to inappropriate development within the Green Belt as the extension, when considered cumulatively with existing and approved extensions to the property, is considered disproportionate to the size of the original building. The Application fails to demonstrate that there are any very special circumstances that exist to clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. The development is therefore contrary to Paragraph 89, Section 9 of the NPPF and Core Policy 51 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy.