

<b>Reference:</b> 23/00149/HHA	<b>Site:</b> Lyndfield Orsett Road Horndon On The Hill Essex RM16 3BH
<b>Ward:</b> Orsett	<b>Proposal:</b> First floor side extension.

<b>Plan Number(s):</b>		
Reference	Name	Received
2058/10	Proposed Elevations	8th February 2023
2058/12	Existing Elevations	8th February 2023
2058/13	Proposed Floor Plans and Location Plan	8th February 2023
2058/11	Existing Floor Plans and Proposed Block Plan	9th March 2023
TT/9	Proposed Garage Plans and Elevations and Sections	6th March 2023
TT/7/R1	Proposed Detached Games Room Plans and Elevations	6th March 2023

The application is also accompanied by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Planning Statement, dated January 2023</li> </ul>	
<b>Applicant:</b> Mr & Mrs Trevor Thornton	<b>Validated:</b> 6 March 2023  <b>Date of expiry:</b> 17 July 2023 (Extension of Time Agreed)
<b>Recommendation:</b> Refusal	

The application is scheduled for determination by the Council's Planning Committee because it has been called in by Cllrs B Johnson, G Snell, B Maney, L Spillman and A Jefferies (in accordance with the Constitution, Chapter 5, Part 3 (b), 2.1 (d) (ii)) to assess the impact of the proposal upon the Green Belt.

## 1.0 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

- 1.1 The application seeks planning permission for a first floor side extension above an existing ground floor extension providing an extra two bedrooms resulting in a four bedroom detached dwelling.

## 2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The application site is a detached property located on the northern side of Orsett Road close to Orsett Fruit Farm. The site is set within a semi-rural residential area and is located within an area designated as Metropolitan Green Belt. Permitted Development rights remain intact.
- 2.2 As set out in the table below, two Lawful Development Certificates have been determined as lawful (Refs: 18/00355/CLOPUD and 18/00334/CLOPUD) for a hip to gable roof alteration and two storey rear extension respectively. Neither development has been implemented as set out in the Planning Statement submitted with this application. This is currently the only additional development that could be carried out at the site.

## 3.0 RELEVANT HISTORY

Application Reference	Description of Proposal	Decision
48/00097/FUL	Rebuilding of piggeries and store	Approved
73/00564/FUL	Kitchen Addition.	Approved
95/00096/FUL	Demolition of existing single garage and erection of detached triple garage	Refused
95/00097/FUL	Two storey side extension to provide elderly persons accommodation and ensuite bathroom and additional bedroom	Refused (Appeal Dismissed)
95/00269/FUL	Single storey side extension to provide elderly persons accommodation	Refused (Appeal Dismissed)
97/00681/FUL	Single storey side extension to provide additional bedroom and extension to living room.	Approved
99/00198/FUL	First floor side extension above	Refused

	partly constructed ground floor extension	
11/00677/HHA	First floor side extension to dwelling.	Refused (Appeal Dismissed)
17/30156/PHMT	Two storey rear extension and 2x side dormers to hipped roof	Advice Given
18/00334/CLOPUD	Two storey rear extension	Approved
18/00335/CLOPUD	Proposed hip to gable and dormers	Approved
18/01050/HHA	First floor side extension	Refused (Appeal Dismissed)
21//30240/PHMT	Feedback on an historical planning application previously refused for a first floor extension.	Advice Given

#### 4.0 CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS

- 4.1 Detailed below is a summary of the consultation responses received. The full version of each consultation response can be viewed on the Council's website via public access at the following link: [www.thurrock.gov.uk/planning](http://www.thurrock.gov.uk/planning)

##### PUBLICITY:

This application has been advertised by way of individual neighbour notification letters, press notice and public site notice which has been displayed nearby. No written comments have been received.

#### 5.0 POLICY CONTEXT

##### National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- 5.1 The revised NPPF was published on 27th March 2012, revised on 24<sup>th</sup> July 2018, February 2019 and again in July 2021. Paragraph 11 of the Framework sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Paragraph 2 of the Framework confirms the tests in s.38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and s.70 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and that the Framework is a material consideration in planning decisions. Paragraph 10 states that in assessing and determining development proposals, local planning authorities should apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

The following headings and content of the NPPF are relevant to the consideration of the current proposals:

- 4. Decision-making
- 12. Achieving well-designed places
- 13. Protecting Green Belt land

#### National Planning Practice Guidance NPPG)

5.2 In March 2014 the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) launched its planning practice guidance web-based resource. This was accompanied by a Written Ministerial Statement which includes a list of the previous planning policy guidance documents cancelled when the NPPF was launched. PPG contains 42 subject areas, with each area containing several subtopics. Those of particular relevance to the determination of this planning application comprise:

- Design
- Determining a planning application
- Green Belt
- Use of Planning Conditions

#### Local Planning Policy: Thurrock Local Development Framework 2015

5.3 The Council adopted the “Core Strategy and Policies for the Management of Development Plan Document” in (as amended) in January 2015. The following Core Strategy policies apply to the proposals:

##### Spatial Policies:

- CSSP4 (Sustainable Green Belt)

##### Thematic Policies:

- CSTP22 (Thurrock Design)
- CSTP23 (Thurrock Character and Distinctiveness)

##### Policies for the Management of Development:

- PMD1 (Minimising Pollution and Impacts on Amenity)
- PMD2 (Design and Layout)

- PMD6 (Development in the Green Belt)
- PMD8 (Parking Standards)

### Thurrock Local Plan

5.4 In February 2014 the Council embarked on the preparation of a new Local Plan for the Borough. Between February and April 2016 the Council consulted formally on an Issues and Options (Stage 1) document and simultaneously undertook a 'Call for Sites' exercise. In December 2018 the Council began consultation on an Issues and Options (Stage 2 Spatial Options and Sites) document, this consultation has now closed and the responses have been considered and reported to Council. On 23 October 2019 the Council agreed the publication of the Issues and Options 2 Report of Consultation on the Council's website and agreed the approach to preparing a new Local Plan.

### 5.5 Thurrock Design Strategy

In March 2017 the Council launched the Thurrock Design Strategy. The Design Strategy sets out the main design principles to be used by applicants for all new development in Thurrock. The Design Strategy is a supplementary planning document (SPD) which supports policies in the adopted Core Strategy.

### 5.6 Thurrock Residential Alterations and Extensions Design Guide (RAE)

In September 2017 the Council launched the RAE Design Guide which provides advice and guidance for applicants who are proposing residential alterations and extensions. The Design Guide is a supplementary planning document (SPD) which supports policies in the adopted Core Strategy.

## **6.0 ASSESSMENT**

### Background

- 6.1 Historical mapping tools indicate that the wider site was formerly a small holding with a residential dwelling located to the south of the site close to the southern boundary abutting Orsett Road. It has been identified that the parcel of land directly to the north of the original dwelling would not be considered as forming part of the residential curtilage as this would be designated land for the small holding, which the applicant has previously indicated was an orchard.
- 6.2 The red line drawn on the submitted location plan omits the above mentioned parcel of land not considered as forming part of the residential curtilage. The Council therefore concurs with the boundary line provided for this application.

- 6.3 The application site has an extensive planning history and permission has previously been granted within the residential curtilage under application references 73/00564/FUL (Kitchen Addition) and 97/00681/FUL (Single storey side extension to provide additional bedroom and extension to living room) whereby the combined floorspace of these developments utilised the two reasonably sized rooms allowance limitation set out in policy PMD6 of the Core Strategy.
- 6.4 It is noted that planning permission was sought in 1995 for a two storey side extension (Ref: 95/00097/FUL) and later the same year for a single storey side extension (Ref: 95/00269/FUL). Both applications were refused by the Council, appeals were lodged by the applicant which were both later dismissed at appeal by the Planning Inspectorate.
- 6.5 In addition, three further planning applications have since been submitted seeking approval for a first floor side extension in the location of the current application being considered. These were submitted under Refs: 99/00198/FUL, 11/00677/HHA and 18/01050/HHA. All of which were refused, and appeals later lodged for the latter two applications. Both appeals were subsequently dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate.
- 6.6 The most recently refused planning application for a first floor side extension (Ref: 18/01050/HHA) was refused for the following reason:

*The proposal is for extensions to the dwelling in excess of the amount that would be considered proportionate to the existing dwelling, in this case, in excess of the two reasonable sized room allowance specified by Policy PMD6 of the Core Strategy. The proposed development is therefore considered to constitute inappropriate development with reference to paragraph 145 of the NPPF and would therefore be, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt. It is considered that the identified harm to the Green Belt is not clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances, with reference to paragraph 88 of the NPPF, required to justify inappropriate development. The proposal is therefore contrary to Chapter 9 of the NPPF and Policy PMD6 of the adopted Thurrock Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Policies for the Management of Development DPD (as amended) 2015.*

*The site is located within the Green Belt, therefore the principle of development could be considered inappropriate and therefore harmful, unless the proposal conforms to policy.*

- 6.7 The appeal relating to the above refusal was determined in April 2019 and dismissed by the Planning Inspector outlining the following reasons:

*Paragraph 145 of the NPPF (prior to the 2021 amendment) regards the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. One of several exceptions is the extension or alteration of a building provided it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. The NPPF does not offer any advice on what might be regarded as “disproportionate” or not, but refers to “size”.*

*Policy PMD6 of the Core Strategy (CS) adopted in January 2015, indicates that an extension must not be disproportionate to the original dwelling. This policy context is broadly in accordance with that of the later NPPF. The policy then goes on to state that in Thurrock this means no larger than two reasonably sized rooms.*

*The Council explains that two previously extensions approved under references 73/00564/FUL and 97/00081/FUL have exceeded the allowance permitted under policy.*

*In comparing the original dwelling to the dwelling it would become should this proposal be permitted, the previous additions including this proposal would result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original dwelling.*

*Consequently the proposal would be inappropriate development that is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and in conflict with CS Policy PMD6 and the NPPF.*

*Openness is an essential characteristic of the Green Belt. The proposal would not increase the footprint of the building and the dwelling is relatively inconspicuous set on a large plot secluded by trees. Although the dwelling’s location and setting would help to moderate the effect on openness, the proposal would change the appearance of the property and considerably increase its bulk therefore increasing its visual impact. This means that there would be harm as openness cannot be preserved.*

*The appellants indicate that it is their view that a more harmful scheme to the openness of the Green Belt could be achieved under permitted development rights. To illustrate this point, two Certificates of Lawfulness of Proposed Use or Development (CLOPUD) have been submitted and approved by the Council. Reference 18/00334/CLOPUD was granted on 25 April 2018 for a two storey rear extension and reference 18/00335/CLOPUD granted on 27 April 2018 for a proposed hip to gable with dormers.*

*I note that the appellants indicate the fallback schemes would be larger in volume than the appeal proposal. However, in my view, neither the two storey rear*

*extension nor the loft conversion would provide the additional two bedrooms sought. Both schemes would have a similar impact on openness to the appeal proposal.*

*There is also a physical possibility that more than one scheme could be carried out. This then negates the fallback position further. Given that the fallback schemes would not provide the accommodation sought, the appeal proposal is preferred, the effect on openness of all three schemes would be similar and there is no mechanism to prevent permitted development rights being implemented in addition to the appeal proposal, the weight I ascribe to the fallback position is limited.*

*The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. Thus, when considering any planning application, substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt. That is a high hurdle to overcome. In this appeal I have found harm to the Green Belt by way of inappropriateness and to its openness. Balanced against that are the other considerations referred to above. They though, for the reasons given, do not clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. The very special circumstances necessary to justify the development have not been demonstrated. Consequently the proposed development conflicts with the aims of CS Policy PMD6 and the NPPF.*

6.8 The assessment below covers the following areas:

- I. Principle OF DEVELOPMENT
- II. Very Special Circumstances
- III. Design, Layout and Character Impact
- IV. Impact on Neighbouring Amenity
- V. Access and Car Parking

- I. PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

6.9 Policy PMD6 of the Core Strategy states that planning permission will only be granted for new development in the Green Belt provided it meets as appropriate the requirements of the NPPF, other policies in this Core Strategy, and the following:

*1. Extensions*

- i. The extension of a building must not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. In the case of residential*



*extensions this means no larger than two reasonably sized rooms or any equivalent amount.*

- ii. *The extension of the curtilage of a residential property which involves an incursion into the Green Belt will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that very special circumstances apply.*

### Green Belt Assessment

- 6.10 The site is located within the Metropolitan Green Belt where strict controls apply in relation all new development.
- 6.11 Core Strategy Policy PMD6 applies in this area. National and local policies, including this policy, seek extensions to residential dwellings to be proportionate and that would consequently not exceed that represented by two reasonably sized rooms for the dwelling.
- 6.12 Based on what is considered as the original footprint of the host dwelling, the original floor space would allow for extensions up to an increased floor area of approximately 29.41sq. metres. This additional increase in floor space could be used for development at any location within the application site, not just for extensions physically connected to the host dwelling.
- 6.13 When including the existing extensions physically connected to the host dwelling, the floor areas occupied by the porch and utility room extension and the single storey side extension (dining room and lounge extension) equates to 63.05sq. metres.
- 6.14 The proposed first floor side extension would occupy a floor area of 36.67sq. metres resulting in the cumulative additional floor area to the host dwelling of 99.72sq. metres. Based on the two reasonable sized rooms allowance set out in paragraph 6.12 the proposal would, in conjunction with existing extensions to the property, collectively be in excess of this limitation by over 70sq. metres.
- 6.15 Furthermore, it is relevant to highlight that in the dismissed appeal decision in March 2019 (Appeal ref: APP/M1595/D/18/3218486) for a first floor side extension it was concluded that *'the previous additions including this proposal would result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original dwelling. In my judgement and taking into account the approach in CS Policy PMD6, the proposal would be a disproportionate addition to the original dwelling.'* Given the scheme proposed under this application would principally be for the same development, there would be no justification in reaching an alternative conclusion at this time.

- 6.16 Therefore, the proposal would be in excess of what would be considered as proportionate development within the Green Belt. The proposal would consequently be contrary to policy PMD6 and guidance set out in the NPPF and be considered as disproportionate development that is inappropriate in the Green Belt.
- 6.17 In addition, as previously mentioned, the detached games room and detached triple garage present at within the application site are not considered original, as supported by Building Control records where these developments were completed circa. 1997. Plans for both buildings have been submitted with the application. The floor areas for both buildings equates to 50.67sq. metres.
- 6.18 When adding this figure to that detailed in paragraph 6.14, the additional development within the application site would equate to a total area in excess of 120sq. metres. The proposal would therefore result in an increase of over 4 times what is permitted under Policy PMD6.

## II. VERY SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES

- 6.19 As detailed above, the proposed development represents inappropriate development within the Metropolitan Green Belt. Paragraph 147 of the NPPF states that inappropriate development is by definition harmful to the Green Belt and that it should not be approved except in very special circumstances.
- 6.20 The NPPF also states "When considering any planning application, Local Planning Authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt". Paragraph 148 states that Very Special Circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.
- 6.21 Neither the NPPF nor the adopted Core Strategy provide guidance as to what can comprise as 'very special circumstances', either singly or in combination. However, some interpretation of very special circumstances has been provided by the Courts. The rarity or uniqueness of a factor may make it very special, but it has also been held that the aggregation of commonplace factors could combine to create very special circumstances (i.e. 'very special' is not necessarily to be interpreted as the converse of 'commonplace'). However, the demonstration of very special circumstances is a 'high' test and the circumstances which are relied upon must be genuinely 'very special'.
- 6.22 With regards to the NPPF, paragraph 143 states *that 'inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances'*. Paragraph 144 goes onto state that, when considering any planning application, local authorities "*should ensure that substantial weight is*

*given to any harm to the Green Belt. Very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations”.*

6.23 Page 16 of the Planning Statement outlines five main reasons which the applicant considers to constitute as Very Special Circumstances. These are summarised and assessed below:

6.24 a) *the absence of demonstrable, actual harm from addition proposed*

The applicant has stated that in the assessment of application ref: 18/01050/HHA the height, depth and location of the additions did not result in the material harm to views into or around the building, and that the openness of the site was not eroded due to design or positioning. In addition, it is put forward that there would be no reasonable additions that could be made to the dwelling under the assessment of the 2 reasonably sized rooms, and given the property currently provides only two bedrooms, better use of the dwelling could be provided if the proposed addition was allowed.

#### Consideration

Whilst it is acknowledged the property currently provides two bedrooms to the first floor, additional reception rooms have been created through previous extensions to the host dwelling which could (and have previously) be used as additional bedroom/s if so required. In addition it should be noted that in dismissing the appeal against the 2018 application the Planning Inspector states at paragraph 8: *“Openness is an essential characteristic of the Green Belt. The proposal would not increase the footprint of the building and the dwelling is relatively inconspicuous set on a large plot secluded by trees. Although the dwelling’s location and setting would help to moderate the effect on openness, **the proposal would change the appearance of the property and considerably increase its bulk therefore increasing its visual impact. This means that there would be harm as openness cannot be preserved,** in addition to the harm arising from the inappropriate development and I attach considerable weight to this harm”.* [[Our emphasis]. Accordingly the applicants assessment of lack of harm is challenged and no weight is attached to the purported very special circumstance.

6.25 b) *the provision of neighbouring development already permitted at Home Farm, one of the closest neighbours to the site. Application ref: 18/01763/HHA*

The applicant has put forward that development within the nearby site known as Home Farm, located to the north east of the application site, has received planning permission for ground floor structures that were linked together. The applicant also puts forward that whilst this site is also located within the Green Belt and the

development completed is akin to that proposed at Lyndfield, the approved development at Home Farm has created a far larger dwelling.

### Consideration

The extensive planning history for Home Farm has been considered and previous planning applications have been refused as well as approved. As a broad overview, these applications have been refused on Green Belt grounds where very special circumstances did not justify the inappropriate development. However, it is relevant to highlight that each application site is assessed on its own merits and whilst the applicant may consider Home Farm to be a similar site, specific site constraints and the coverage of what is considered as the original dwelling would have been established when assessing planning applications relating to this site, and would be of relevance as to the extent of what would be considered as two reasonably sized rooms. For example, the larger the original dwelling, the larger coverage extensions allowed under Policy PMD6 would be likely to have. Furthermore, it is noted that the application referred to at Home Farm included the demolition of a garage and rear extension in lieu of the proposed development consisting of a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension. Given that each application site is assessed on its own merits, and that the original dwelling at Home Farm varies to that at Lyndfield, it is considered that this reasoning affords no weight as a very special circumstance.

6.26 *c) the presence of a lean-to on the dwelling known as Lyndfield in 1937, therefore comprising part of the original dwelling*

The applicant refers to historical OS plans dating back to 1958 where a lean-to outshot structure is present to the host dwelling. It is put forward that the kitchen extension now present (approved under ref: 73/00564/FUL) replaced this element of the building, and should therefore not be considered as additional development.

### Consideration

It is considered that the authenticity of the above statement does not need to be established for the following reason. The extended kitchen, labelled as a utility room on floor plans, has a coverage of 10.05sq. metres. Even if this area were to be deducted for the overall increase in floor area to the host dwelling as set out in Paragraph 6.20 the proposal would continue to result in additional development in excess of the two reasonably sized room allowance set out in Policy PMD6. Therefore, this very special circumstance would be afforded limited weight.

6.27 *d) the provision of a unilateral undertaking that revokes both the outstanding lawful development certificates*

The applicant has put forward that an agreement to revoke the existing Lawful Development Certificates (refs: 18/00334/CLOPUD and 18/00355/CLOPUD) would ensure that the lawful extension and roof alteration could not be built. In addition, it is put forward that removing Permitted Development Rights for the wider application site would ensure that if permission were granted for the proposed first floor side extension that no other development could be carried out within the site without first additional planning permission. This reasoning has been proposed given the comments made by the Planning Inspector when dealing with the appeal for application ref: 18/01050/HHA (Appeal ref: APP/M1595/D/18/321848) whereby it was suggested that fallback position merit attributed was limited.

### Consideration

Whilst the applicant states that both lawful permissions would be revoked immediately should permission be granted, this would not necessarily be considered to afford significant weight given that the aforementioned Lawful Development Certificates were determined in April 2018 and they have not yet been implemented. In addition, as highlighted by the Inspector, the development permitted under these applications would not provide two additional bedrooms. However, whilst the internal number of rooms would be achieved, these would not be in the locations preferred by the applicant. Although the Inspector acknowledged that if the development permitted under the Lawful Development applications were to be implemented these would result in a negative aesthetic impact upon the host dwelling, this would not afford significant weight in terms of very special circumstances due to the lack of intention shown by the applicant to implement either of these developments. For this reason, very limited weight would be afforded to very special circumstances in this instance.

6.28 *e) the provision of a unilateral undertaking revoking permitted development Classes A to D upon the favourable determination of this application*

The applicant argues that the removal of Permitted Development Rights to Home Farm only included Class A. Their Unilateral Undertaking proposal would include further development whereby the limitations of what could be implemented under Permitted Development would be significantly reduced in comparison. It has been suggested that this agreement would have an expiry date of 3 years where should the proposal not be built out then Permitted Development Rights would be reinstated.

Consideration

These mitigation measures offered would not necessarily be considered to overcome the current issue with development within the application site as the ground area occupied by the games room and garage equates to over 91% of the ground area occupied by the host dwelling. However, being able to limit and restrict further additional development would be favourable and affords limited weight in terms of very special circumstances.

6.29 A summary of the weight which has been placed on the various Green Belt considerations is provided below:

<b>Summary of Green Belt Harm and Very Special Circumstances</b>			
<b>Harm</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Factors Promoted as Very Special Circumstances</b>	<b>Weight</b>
Inappropriate development	Substantial	<i>a) the absence of demonstrable, actual harm from addition proposed</i>	No weight
		<i>b) the provision of neighbouring development already permitted at Home Farm, one of the closest neighbours to the site. Application ref: 18/01763/HHA</i>	No weight
		<i>c) the presence of a lean-to on the dwelling known as Lyndfield in 1937, therefore comprising part of the original dwelling</i>	Very limited weight
		<i>d) the provision of a unilateral undertaking that revokes both the outstanding lawful development certificates</i>	Very limited weight
		<i>e) the provision of a unilateral undertaking revoking permitted development Classes A to D upon the favourable determination of this application</i>	Limited weight

6.30 In reaching a conclusion on Green Belt issues, a judgement as to the balance between harm and whether the harm is clearly outweighed must be reached. In this case there is harm to the Green Belt with reference to inappropriate development (i.e. harm by definition), loss of openness and harm to Green Belt purpose. The five factors promoted by the applicant as considerations amounting to 'Very Special Circumstances' necessary to justify inappropriate development and for the Committee to judge:

- i. the weight to be attributed to these factors;
- ii. whether the factors are genuinely 'Very Special' (i.e. site specific) or whether the accumulation of generic factors combine at this location to comprise 'Very Special Circumstances'.

6.31 It is considered that the applicant has not advanced any factors which would cumulatively amount to Very Special Circumstances that could overcome the harm that would result by way of inappropriateness and the other harm identified in the assessment. The proposal is clearly contrary to Policies CSSP4, PMD2 and PMD6 of the adopted Thurrock Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Policies for the Management of Development (as amended 2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

### III. DESIGN, LAYOUT AND CHARACTER IMPACT

6.32 The overall design of the proposal is considered sympathetic and relates suitably to the character of the host dwelling. The ridge line of the proposed roof would be set lower than that of the original roof forming an 'M' shaped dual pitch roof when viewing from the west which would be somewhat unconventional. However, this would not be sufficient reason to recommended for refusal as the level of harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling would be limited.

6.33 Given the position and orientation of the host dwelling within the application site, the proposal would be visible from the driveway serving the site. However, given the majority of the driveway is set beyond the entrance gates close to the adjacent highway of Orsett Road, the visual impact from a public realm would be limited in this instance.

6.34 For the reasons set out above, it is considered the proposal would be acceptable in relation to policies CSTP22, CSTP23 and PMD2.

### IV. IMPACT ON NEIGHBOURING AMENITY

- 6.35 Due to the level of separation between neighbouring properties, the proposal would not result in additional impacts upon amenity and would be in accordance with policy PMD1 and the Residential Alterations and Extensions SPD 2017.

## V. ACCESS AND CAR PARKING

- 6.36 The proposal would result in an uptake in the parking provision requirements given the increase in the number of bedrooms. However, the level of hardstanding to the south west of the site close to the access gates and detached garage would be of a sufficient area to accommodate the extra provision. Therefore, the proposal would be in accordance with policy PMD8.

## 7.0 CONCLUSIONS AND REASON(S) FOR REFUSAL

- 7.1 The application site is located within the Metropolitan Green Belt where limitations apply in relation to additional development permitted, as set out in policy PMD6. Existing development present within the application site already exceeds the two reasonably sized room allowance, and therefore, the proposal would further increase this excess.
- 7.2 Whilst the applicant has put forward five separate Very Special Circumstances, these have been considered and assessed. These factors would not cumulatively amount to Very Special Circumstances that could overcome the harm that would result by way of the inappropriateness and other harm identified by way of disproportionate development in the Green Belt.

## 8.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 8.1 Refuse planning permission for the following reasons:

- 1 The proposal is for extensions to the dwelling in excess of the amount that would be considered proportionate to the existing dwelling, in this case, in excess of the two reasonable sized room allowance specified by Policy PMD6 of the Core Strategy. The development would therefore result in inappropriate development in the Green Belt which is, by definition, harmful. The proposal would also cause a reduction in the openness. It is not considered that the matters put forward as very special circumstances clearly outweigh the identified harm to the Green Belt so as to amount to the very special circumstances required to justify inappropriate development. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies CSSP4 and PMD6 of the adopted Thurrock Core Strategy and Policies for the Management of Development (as amended 2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.



**Informative:**

Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) - Positive and Proactive Statement:

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and determining the application within a timely manner, clearly setting out the reason(s) for refusal, allowing the Applicant/Agent the opportunity to consider the harm caused and whether or not it can be remedied by a revision to the proposal. The Local Planning Authority is willing to liaise with the Applicant/Agent to discuss the best course of action and is also willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.

**Documents:**

All background documents including application forms, drawings and other supporting documentation relating to this application can be viewed online:

[www.thurrock.gov.uk/planning](http://www.thurrock.gov.uk/planning)



