



DELEGATED REPORT

ASSESSMENT of project to implementation in accordance with the Bat Survey Report.

CONCLUSIONS

The proposed plan extends permission no. 66890. The present was disproportionate at the additional proposed buildings and would result in any proportionate building costs to the original housing of the Green Belt via the residential amenity Green Beltist the proposal considered that the principle with less significant use of public land would NPPF. Therefore, in accordance with the Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, the proposal merits approval.

However, in dismissing the subsequent appeal, the Inspector considered that having regard to the linear nature of the existing dwelling and the subservient nature of the proposed extensions, their modest scale, and the fact that together they fell within the guidelines for extensions in Supplementary Planning Document 8 - New Buildings and Associated Development in the Green Belt, then the scheme would not result in a disproportionate addition to the existing building.

Thereafter, the Inspector considered that the proposed comparatively wide window openings would not be reflective of the existing fenestration in the building and that it would also be at odds with the existing high solid to void ratio that is characteristic of the existing building. The resulting harm arising to the host building from the proposed fenestration would be easily visible from the public right of way and would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. For this reason, the appeal was dismissed.

The proposed extension is therefore of the same scale, dimensions and mass as the former, but the proposed window dimensions/proportions to the side elevation of the extension would be much reduced. Specifically, the width of the windows have been reduced and the proportions would have a greater vertical emphasis and some windows have been replaced with smaller ones in different positions to give a more random layout, akin to traditional vernacular agricultural buildings. Externally, the proposed extension would be finished in coursed natural stone (mainly square/rectangular in form) to match existing walls of the adjoining building (other parts of the building are finished in random stone) and the roof in natural blue slate.

Given the above circumstances, the proposal would not constitute a disproportionate extension to the existing building, would suitably assimilate with the host building and would not have any unacceptable impacts on visual amenity.

Public Rights of Way

One bigger dwelling would be considered to be acceptable in highways terms. The site can be accessed from right of way 21BUR and 24BUR. Recent building work in the area appears to have caused deterioration of the latter bridleway. The site however appears to be accessed via bridleway 21BUR.

As a result of the aforementioned building work however, the public rights of way officer (when commenting on the previous proposal) sought to ensure that proper consideration is given to how the site is accessed during development, both in terms of the route taken and the vehicles used. 21BUR is the obvious route and is outlined in red on the submitted plan. That would be the preferred route and 24BUR should not be used and a condition was proposed to ensure this. Such a condition should therefore be applied in relation to the present proposal.

Residential Amenity

SPD 6 and H2/3 seek to reduce the impact of proposals on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

Due to the location of the site no residential amenity issues are foreseen.

Other matters

The GMEU are satisfied that the proposal would have no adverse impacts upon ecological