

DELEGATED REPORT

FILE REFERENCE: SMD/2014/0829

MAIN ISSUES: Principal; Impact on openness of Green Belt; Impact on visual / residential amenities

PUBLICITY/REPRESENTATIONS: None received

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT: This application is a re-submission of a previously refused planning application (SMD/2014/0450). The proposal is still for a detached garage in the same location. However, this time the applicant has submitted information with regards to potential fall back positions through permitted development. The starting point for the Council is that there is no exception in Green Belt policy for supporting detached structures in the curtilage of domestic properties. Therefore, as a consequence the proposal is considered to constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and 'very special circumstances' would have to be demonstrated to outweigh the harm created. However, in this instance the property benefits from PD rights as they have not been removed and it is therefore considered appropriate to consider whether or not there was a viable fall back position i.e. if planning permission was refused what could the applicant reasonably do? In this instance the Council concurs with the applicant that there is a genuine fall back position.

The green belt is all about maintaining the openness of land and an integral part of the assessment is between what is proposed, the justification for it and what could happen and whether or not there is any benefit of removing further PD rights as part of any approval of planning permission. This application site does have the ability to erect a detached structure to the east of the existing house as demonstrated, but there is also scope for similar buildings to be erected to the south of the house in the rear garden, subject to the guidelines of Class E of Part 1 of the GPDO.

The Council has considered the fall back position at great length and consider that the property could erect various structures under Class E and create greater harm to the openness of the Green Belt. Whilst the siting of the proposal is located beyond the front elevation of the house, it will not have a prominent or more harmful impact, than if it was located elsewhere in the site, such as directly to the east. This is due to the relatively isolated and enclosed nature of the site and also the fact that the proposed location within the domestic unit is hard surfaced. Officers have concluded that it is not unreasonable for a domestic property to have a detached garage, but did question the original size proposed. After negotiations with the applicant and receiving further details of what the building is to be used for and what other detached buildings are on site for storage, it was determined that an amended footprint of 6m by 7.5m was not unreasonable. The building is to be used for the storage of motor vehicles and the storage and maintenance of bicycles. In addition, there is only another shed on site that is at capacity for storing domestic items. On this basis the proposal is considered acceptable and recommended for approval as it accords with Core Strategy Policies DC1 & DC3 and guidance contained within the NPPF. However, due to the flexible approach the Council is applying to this proposal and taking into account the genuine fallback position, the Council will withdraw existing PD rights for detached structures under Part 1, Class E of the GPDO, so to prevent any harm to the openness of the Green Belt.

RECOMMENDATION: Conditionally approve

Date 25/03/2015

Signed _____
Wayne Johnson

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MANAGER COMMENTS:

Date

Signed _____