



**DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING  
AND CONSTRUCTION OF TWO  
DWELLINGS  
AT  
THE OWLS NEST,  
BELBROUGHTON ROAD,  
CLENT,  
STOURBRIDGE DY9 9RB**

**PLANNING STATEMENT  
August 2023**

The Coach House  
45B Rother Street  
Stratford-upon-Avon  
Warwickshire  
CV37 6LT

tel: 01789 204293  
mobile: 07808 367061  
email: [donna@dsplanning.co.uk](mailto:donna@dsplanning.co.uk)



## **CONTENTS**

<b>1. Introduction and Summary</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2. Site and Surroundings</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3. Recent Approved Schemes</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>4. The Proposal</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>5. Policy Considerations</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>6. Planning Evaluation</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>7. Conclusion</b>	<b>22</b>

**PLANNING STATEMENT**

THE OWLS NEST, BELBROUGHTON LANE, CLENT DY9 9RB

---



**Context – aerial photo 2021**

## **1. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY**

- 1.1 The application seeks planning permission for the demolition of an existing dwelling at Belbroughton Road, Clent and the erection of two new dwellings.
- 1.2 The application site lies towards the south of the settlement of Clent and Holy Cross which itself lies to the southeast of Stourbridge. To the northwest is Hagley and both Clent and Hagley lie on the west side of the A491 Stourbridge Road, a dual carriageway. The application site is situated to the east side of Belbroughton Road and south of the village.
- 1.3 Two Householder Prior Approval applications were submitted in 2022. One related to a rear extension and the other to a first-floor extension. Bromsgrove Council concluded that Prior Approval was not required for the rear extension (22/00900/HHPRIO) of 8 metres from the rear wall of the original dwelling. The Council also concluded that the upward extension (22/00930/HHPRIO) required Prior Approval and approved the submitted details.
- 1.4 In 2019 a pre-application dialogue was undertaken. The planning officer supported redevelopment of the land for two houses and considered that it complied with paragraph 145 of the NPPF and Policy BDP 4.4 of the adopted Development Plan.
- 1.5 The current submission seeks planning permission for the demolition of the existing house and its replacement by two two-storey houses.
- 1.6 This Planning Statement supports a full planning application and forms part of a suite of drawings that accompany the proposed scheme, comprising:
- 067-100 Location and Site Plans
  - 067-101 Plans and Elevations as Existing

## PLANNING STATEMENT

THE OWLS NEST, BELBROUGHTON LANE, CLENT DY9 9RB

---

- 067-102 Elevations as Existing
- 067-103 Plans as Approved -Combined Prior Approvals
- 067-104 Plans as Approved -Combined Prior Approvals
- 067-105 Elevations as Approved -Combined Prior Approvals
- 067-106 Elevations as Approved -Combined Prior Approvals
- 067-107 Plot 1 Plans as Proposed
- 067-108 Plot 2 Plans as Proposed
- 067-109 Plot 1 Elevations as Proposed
- 067-110 Plot 2 Elevations as Proposed
- 067-111 Street Elevations as Proposed & Site Plan

1.7 In addition, the application is accompanied by a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal with Preliminary Roost Assessment from Focus Environmental Consultants, dated July 2023.

1.8 This Planning Statement demonstrates that the proposed development accords with both national and local planning policies and that there are no material considerations that would justify withholding planning permission.

## **2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

- 2.1 The Owls Nest is a single storey dwelling built originally of brick and a coloured render and now with a white rendered finish. It has a multi-pitched tiled roof with areas of flat roof to the rear. There are bow windows to the front and there is integral garaging. In the garden there is a large timber shed with a felt roof.
- 2.2 The rear garden contains two areas of hard surface / patios, and is otherwise lawned. The front garden is also lawned. There is a dark brick and gravel driveway. The frontage has low dwarf walls with a brick on edge coping. Along the northern boundary is a hedge. The east and south boundaries are delineated by wooden fences.
- 2.3 The site is relatively flat though it is set just above the level of the highway.
- 2.4 The site extends to around 1670 square metres. It is rectangular in shape. To the rear is open land (not agricultural) and beyond that is an assisted care establishment.
- 2.5 The Owls Nest was originally a modest bungalow built in the 1960s. In 2016 permission was granted to divide it into two dwellings (16/0618). The scheme was approved and implemented.
- 2.6 The Owls Nest has been extended both to the side and rear. The bungalow fills the width of its plot making views to the rear impossible. It appears considerably larger in the street scene especially when compared to the dwellings to each side, both of which are located in narrower plots. The Owls Nest occupies an unusually wide plot size, roughly double adjoining plot widths.
- 2.7 Opposite is housing and the locality, the immediate physical context, is wholly residential in character and appearance. There are a variety of building forms, scales and details including materials. While there

**PLANNING STATEMENT**

THE OWLS NEST, BELBROUGHTON LANE, CLENT DY9 9RB

---

is no consistency, the street scene is not inharmonious. There are 1.5 storey and 1.75 storey buildings opposite and close by. Looking at the wider context there is a wide variety of heights and designs, local housing is completely lacking in consistency.

- 2.8 The village is of a noticeably dispersed nature with linear development along the routes that meet at the centre of the village where the Bell and Cross is located. The village envelope is entirely irregular in shape.
- 2.9 The village is served by a bus service. There is a village hall on Church Avenue (though the church lies to the northeast), a social club and a primary school.
- 2.10 The application site lies within the Green Belt.



### **3. RECENT APPROVED SCHEMES**

- 3.1 As indicated elsewhere in this Planning Statement, in 2022 submissions were made to Bromsgrove District Council in relation to the prior notification process. The first submission related to a rear extension and the second to an upward extension.
- 3.2 In the case of the rear extension (22/00900/HHPRIO) Bromsgrove District Council concluded that Prior Approval was not required for a single storey rear extension. Accordingly, a decision confirming that the development was permitted under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of The Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) was issued on 23 August 2022.
- 3.3 In the case of the upward extension (22/00930/HHPRIO) Bromsgrove District Council concluded, after amended plans were submitted and after consultation with neighbours, that Prior Approval was required and concluded that the submitted details were approved. Approval was granted and development formally permitted under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of The Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015(as amended) subject to conditions on 4 October 2022 subject to conditions.
- 3.4 It is considered that the approved 2022 schemes are capable of construction and provide, singly or combined, a fallback position. They provide a footprint of 300.72 square metres, and a total floor area of 457.97 square metres with a volume of 1472.69 cubic metres. The maximum building height is 6.8 metres.



## **4. THE PROPOSAL**

- 4.1 The application site contains a dwelling with an attached car port/garage and rear extensions. There is a freestanding garden building. The entire site is residential. The current application seeks planning permission for the demolition of the existing house and its replacement by two new houses.
- 4.2 The development options have been carefully considered. The existing building could be enlarged. Alternatively, the existing building could be modified by removing the garage and other accommodation to form a plot for one house. Finally, the building could be demolished in its entirety and two plots formed.
- 4.3 The applicant, like Central Government, Local Government, businesses, and residents, is aware of soaring energy costs and the need to future proof housing in these times of climate change and broad financial uncertainty. A further point that has needed to be very carefully considered is design.
- 4.4 Lawful development takes no account of design, form (other than the legal requirements usually as to height), mass nor to internal layout. Permitted development and lawful development often gives rise to poor or inadequate design as the focus can be on meeting the standard for exemption rather than meeting the desire to provide a good or appropriate standard for the long-term. Permitted development and prior approval are not mechanisms for improving design, the opposite is the case, they can drive standards down thereby devaluing and diminishing the built environment by ignoring context and visual coherence. They also ignore energy and water efficiency. They are a very useful asset for extension but sometimes a redevelopment rather than extension is a much better outcome.

- 4.5 It is proposed to demolish the existing house and provide two plots on the site each containing a two-storey dwelling. Plot 1 would have a plot size of 849.8 square metres while Plot 2 would have an area of 844.18 square metres.
- 4.6 The proposed replacement houses - in terms of disposition and position within the plots and the wider street scene - would respond to the existing positions of neighbouring dwellings. Great care has been taken to locate and position the proposed houses to avoid potential adverse effects. In addition, openings to the side elevations have been kept to a minimum, again to protect and preserve established and proposed amenity and privacy.
- 4.7 The internal layouts are efficient and well considered, offering a flexible layout, suitable for many potential occupiers. They have different layouts, similar but not identical. The elevations have been designed to fit well in the street scene and pick up on the gables and narrow steep roof forms seen opposite as well as the forms of the bungalows to the north and south. As there is so much variety of forms and treatments, the proposed houses look different from each other but bear a family resemblance.
- 4.8 The result is simple, unfussy rectangular forms with uncomplicated massing and a pleasing scale and similarity. The proposed development comprises houses with a plan form comprising two rectangles joined and offset. Both houses are two storeys in height. The roofs are hipped and tiled, with a platform section centrally located and obscured from view by pitched slopes. One unit is shown with a front facing gable and a dormer to front and rear, the other with front facing twin gables. The front fenestration is rhythmic, strongly articulated, balanced, and plain, quasi-symmetrical around a central front door with a small canopy.

- 4.9 The terms of height the proposed houses are no higher than the height allowed by the fallback scheme. Materials proposed for the development are red brick with plain clay tiles. Fenestration is proposed as traditional with brick arches.
- 4.10 Plot 1 would have a footprint of 109.04 square metres and a floor area of 218.08 square metres and a volume of 765 cubic metres. Plot 2 would have a footprint of 108.03 square metres, a floor area of 216.06 square metres and a volume of 703 cubic metres.
- 4.11 Combined together the proposed development represents a reduction in footprint (28% less), a reduction in floor area of (5.2% less) and a reduction in volume (0.3% less). The maximum height of the approved schemes would not be exceeded and would be 6.8 metres.
- 4.12 In other words, an improved design and an improved standard of development is proposed, better than that which can be delivered under the prior approval process. An additional house would be secured. That fully accords with national government's aim to deliver more housing.
- 4.13 The proposed development is considered, well-mannered, developed in accordance with the High Quality Design SPD and would provide high quality homes with very high standards of insulation, with low energy and low water use at the forefront of their design.

## **5. POLICY CONSIDERATIONS**

### Principle of Development

- 5.1 The principle of development is established in national and local planning policy. Government policy set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) July 2021 confirms the primacy of the Development Plan and states that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The Framework requires Local Planning Authorities to have Development Plans in place which are up to date and which comply with national policy.
- 5.2 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that the starting point for considering development proposals is the Development Plan and goes on to say that “*the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.*” Central Government advice is a key material planning consideration.
- 5.3 The Development Plan is the Bromsgrove District Plan (BDP) 2011 - 2030, adopted on 25 January 2017. The following policies are most relevant:
- Policy BDP 1            Sustainable Development Principles
  - Policy BDP 2            Settlement Hierarchy
  - Policy BDP 4            Green Belt
  - Policy BDP 19          High Quality Design
  - Policy BDP 21          Natural Environment
  - Policy BDP 22          Climate Change
  - Policy BDP 24          Green Infrastructure
- 5.4 In addition, the High Quality Design SPD (adopted 2019) is relevant.

## **National Planning Policy Framework 2021**

- 5.5 Government policy set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) July 2021 confirms the importance of the Development Plan and sustainable development. Development Plans should be up to date and compliant with national policy.
- 5.6 An aim of the NPPF is to boost housing that comprises sustainable development whilst at the same time attaching great importance to the design of the built environment and other matters. The natural environment is to be safeguarded too. Good design is identified as a key aspect of sustainable development. The BDP confirms these key principles and fully accords with the NPPF.
- 5.7 Section 13 of the NPPF concerns the Green Belt. Paragraphs 137 to 146 relate to the protection of Green Belt land. Paragraph 138 sets out the five purposes of Green Belt designation:
- To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas;
  - To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
  - To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
  - To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
  - To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.
- 5.8 Paragraph 147 reiterates that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Substantial weight must be given to any potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm according to paragraph 148.
- 5.9 Paragraph 149 sets out exceptions where the construction of new buildings is 'not inappropriate' in the Green Belt. The definition includes at (e)

*"limited infilling within villages"*

5.10 The definition includes at (g)

*"limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would:*

- *not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development;..."*

5.11 In addition, it says at (d) that the exceptions include *"the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces"*. A further exception is identified at (c) as follows *'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'*.

5.12 Within the NPPF, it is stated that planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective reuse of previously developed land (PDL). PDL is defined in the Framework's Glossary. While PDL does not include residential land in built-up areas, it is clear that in rural areas, residential land may be defined as PDL and in this case it is considered that the application site comprises PDL. This was the standpoint taken during pre-application discussions.

5.13 Elsewhere the NPPF sets out the need to conserve and enhance the natural environment. The planning system should protect and enhance valued landscapes and minimise adverse effects on biodiversity. The NPPF states that decisions and policy should encourage the effective use of land that is PDL provided that it is not of high environmental value. Protected wildlife should be safeguarded. Significant harm to biodiversity should be avoided. Chapter 15 sets out the position in full.

## **6. PLANNING EVALUATION**

### Green Belt Issues

- 6.1 The application site comprises previously developed land, as defined in the NPPF, and is located within the West Midlands Green Belt. It is a developed plot in a developed frontage. Demolition of the house would create a gap in an otherwise developed frontage. The proposal should be considered to be a form of replacement / redevelopment or infill. Those facts are the starting point for consideration.
- 6.2 National and adopted local planning policies seek to protect the Green Belt by resisting inappropriate development, which is by definition harmful and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. The most important characteristic of Green Belts is their openness. Openness is not defined.
- 6.3 The site also lies outside the defined settlement boundary however the site is physically and functionally attached to the settlement. Clent and High Cross are dispersed settlements with a number of developed clusters.
- 6.4 NPPF paragraph 149 g) says that new buildings are not inappropriate in the Green Belt where *"limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use ....., which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development."* This policy is reflected in adopted BDP 4.4g).
- 6.5 The text supporting BDP 4 Green Belt indicates that the purposes of the Green Belt will be upheld by resisting inappropriate development within it, except in cases where new buildings are justified, in accordance with the provisions of national planning policy. It further identifies the need for a Green Belt Review to accommodate further

housing and it is clear that Green Belt boundaries will need to alter to accommodate the necessary housing numbers.

6.6 BDP 4.4 says that the following forms of development are not inappropriate in principle:

*"(c) Extensions to existing residential dwellings up to a maximum of 40% increase of the original dwelling or increases up to a maximum floor space of 140m<sup>2</sup> ('original' dwelling plus extension(s)) provided that this scale of development has no adverse impact on the openness of the Green Belt.*

*(e) The replacement of a building provided the new building is in the same use and should not be materially larger than the building it replaces.*

*(f) Limited infilling in green belt settlements and rural exception sites in accordance with BDP9 Rural Exception Sites*

*(g) Limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites that would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development.*

6.6 BDP 4.4 (c) (e) (f) and (g) reflect the thrust of the NPPF, if not to the letter, as set out in paragraph 149. The clear direction of the NPPF is evident. In this case, while the proposal is to replace a house with two houses, the proposal should be viewed as the redevelopment of PDL or the limited infilling within a settlement. I examine each in turn below.

6.7 In terms of the redevelopment of PDL a prime consideration is the impact upon the openness of the Green Belt. The need is for the proposal to have no greater impact upon the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development.



- 6.8 While openness is not defined within the NPPF (or indeed elsewhere) it can be assumed from case law and challenges, that it refers to the absence of development. This can mean buildings, surfaces, fences, or structures. Often Local Planning Authorities assume that volume, footprint and/or floor area are proxy measures for assessing openness or the lack of it. In national guidance this approach is neither supported nor advised. It is often overlooked that some types of development do not have significant volume or extent, but they may nevertheless have an effect upon openness. For instance, hard surfaces can be significantly harmful in the Green Belt. Likewise fencing, especially high close mesh security fencing can have an adverse effect upon openness.
- 6.9 In this particular case, it is essential to consider the current proposal in the context of what has been approved previously and what may be built without further statutory control.
- 6.10 The recent 2022 prior approval decisions demonstrated that a significantly enlarged house (albeit of limited design merit), over two floors, in the same position could be built within the site. The height now proposed for the two proposed dwellings is as previously accepted. The footprint and volume proposed for two dwellings is smaller than would be delivered under the combined prior approval schemes.
- 6.11 The proposed houses are, by any measure normally employed in the planning process, smaller than the development that could legally be built on the site. The replacement dwellings would have less impact on the Green Belt than an extended house if volume and footprint are accepted as proxies. The proposed dwellings would also be better designed, something promoted by Government and by the BDP, and would be more sustainable in terms of construction being better insulated, with lower energy needs and lower water consumption.

- 6.12 While demolition of the existing house might superficially not appear to represent the most sustainable option, the existing building is of limited value being of a poor standard of construction in terms of thermal efficiency and energy/water consumption. It was built when prevailing standards were low and retrofitting to 21<sup>st</sup> century standards is not a simple, easy, or attractive option, either economically or environmentally.
- 6.13 An enlarged dwelling is permitted by lawful means without the need for further planning process. That dwelling if formed would have a greater effect upon openness and upon the Green Belt than the two dwellings being considered now. The effect of an enlarged dwelling must be judged to be adverse. Given that the now-proposed houses are smaller, and the same policies apply, the proposed pair of dwellings must be viewed as a preferred and more desirable option in terms of policy, both national and local. It would not be reasonable to promote the extended larger house and to limit or prevent a smaller, more efficient, and sustainable development of two houses.
- 6.14 The test set out in paragraph 149 (g) in relation to redevelopment of PDL is that there should be no greater impact upon openness. There is no other or alternative test. The current proposal would have a lesser impact upon openness than the alternative scheme (the fallback extended house). The more sustainable scheme and the more desirable scheme in planning terms is the two replacement 7
- 6.15 As previously stated it is also possible to consider the site as 'limited infilling within a village'. As stated paragraph 149 (e) of the NPPF limited infilling in villages is an exception to the policy of Green Belt restraint.
- 6.16 Before considering paragraph 149 (e) in detail there are some relevant matters that need to be understood clearly. The application site comprises previously developed land (as defined in the NPPF

Glossary) as the application site is not within the settlement boundary as advised on the Policies Map. There is development on both sides of the site as well as opposite with further development to the rear, beyond a small area of open land. The term built-up area is not defined in the NPPF Glossary, but a reasonable person asked about their impression of the application site is likely to consider it as surrounded by development i.e. 'built-up', especially due to the position of the speed limits signs as well as its proximity to the village.

- 6.17 Paragraph 149 e) of the Framework supports limited infilling in villages. We look at this exception in stages. The proposal supported by this statement is limited to two dwellings, which must certainly be classed as infill.
- 6.18 It is also the case that the site and its neighbours appear as part of the village. Owls Nest and this part of the village are shown on the LP policy plan for Clent and Holy Cross (identified as a Village suitable for infill) as outside the village envelope. The village envelope is defined clearly however it is not clear why it has been drawn in this particular way.
- 6.19 The High Court judgement in Julian Wood v The Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and Gravesham Borough Council 2015 made it clear that a common sense, on the ground view should be taken as to the physical extent of a village. In this case, the site lies within the village according to the speed limits signage, within the village in terms of the footpath and within walking distance of the village facilities. The High Court judgement made it clear that reliance should not be solely placed on the boundary, defined in this case in a Local Plan map.
- 6.20 Clent and Holy Cross have been identified as settlements where infill development is acceptable.

- 6.21 The 2015 High Court judgement clearly found that a common-sense approach should be used. In this case, the position of the site within the street between other physical developments, the marked/signed entrance to the village in terms of speed limits, the existence of a footpath and the ease and proximity of access to services within the settlement, clearly indicates the strong functional and physical connection of the application site to the village. Common sense dictates that this site should be considered to be within the village.
- 6.22 It is agreed in LP terms that Clent and Holy Cross are suitable places for infill housing development. It has many services and facilities. That is demonstrably agreed, and the applicants' team wishes to highlight this starting point. What is not agreed is that the boundary of the envelope is correctly placed for all decisions or relevant in all respects. We consider it should include the existing development along Belbroughton Road as it is demonstrably functionally and physically part of the village.
- 6.23 This part of Belbroughton Road is within the village speed limits. The properties are linked both physically and functionally to the village. There is a footpath that links to the village and though it may not be well illuminated it is nevertheless a footpath on which many people travel to and from the village. The footpath would allow the occupants of the new houses to walk to the local facilities or to catch a bus. Alternatively, they could cycle. Existing local residents use the footpath and village facilities etc. It would be quite wrong, inconsistent, and incorrect to assume that new residents would not.
- 6.24 In summary, on the matter of Clent and Holy Cross and their designation as villages suitable for infill, the applicant and his advisors consider the proposal to comprise limited infilling within the village. A village already accepted as suitable for housing development. The proposal complies with paragraph 149 e) and is

not inappropriate development either in terms of the NPPF or in terms of LP Policy DS18. VSC's are therefore not required.

### Other Issues

#### Design and Neighbour Amenity

- 6.25 All of the above largely ignores the benefit of improved design which should be considered separately although it has previously been accepted that improved design is beneficial. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development according to BDP paragraph 8.189. Good design principles should underpin development in cities, towns, villages, and rural areas. BDP 19 clearly sets out the requirements and reasons for the adoption of good design standards and principles everywhere.
- 6.26 Good design can seldom overcome significant policy objections. Here, where there is no inherent policy conflict, the improved design (over and above the approved 2022 submissions) schemes, should be considered as a considerable positive gain or a benefit. There can be no doubt that the existing dwelling makes no contribution to architecture and design. The existing dwelling has been allowed to evolve ad hoc and it is now judged unsuitable for contemporary use given its layout and its construction, especially in terms of energy. The proposal would secure two significantly superior houses, better looking, more efficient in terms of energy, materials, and water, more user-friendly and adaptable to the lifetime needs of owners in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.
- 6.27 It is essential to ensure that there would be no adverse effect upon neighbours. Harm has to be avoided in terms of loss of privacy or amenity. The effect upon neighbours has been fully considered and design considered so that for instance there will not be overshadowing and layout has been designed in such a way to ensure

the 45 degree rule is not breached. The proposal is acceptable in terms of policy and guidance in relation to the street scene, neighbours, and the physical context. Policy BDP19 is not offended.

#### Ecology

- 6.28 Ecological matters have been fully considered and are set out in the accompanying document. There are no trees within the site and the plot has little value in terms of habitat. There are limited ecological interests to be considered. The sole ecological value within the site relates to the established hedge along the north boundary. It is to be retained and other native hedging planted to augment biodiversity and ecological interest. Policy BDP21 is not offended.

#### Highways

- 6.29 There are limited highways issues to be considered as the proposal would give rise to a modest change to existing arrangements. Each proposed house would be provided with a separate drive rather than the sole drive that exists at present. Visibility is good and the road alignment is straight. There is no reason why two satisfactory access points may not be provided. There is more than adequate parking and turning space within each plot for parking and turning. The replacement dwellings would continue to take access from Belbroughton Road.

#### Settlement Hierarchy

- 6.30 Adopted BDP2 sets out a settlement hierarchy for the distribution of housing starting with Bromsgrove Town. The proposed replacement dwellings would not conflict with overall housing policies, its effect would be neutral. There would be no adverse effect upon infrastructure or existing facilities.

## Design

- 6.31 The NPPF attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. It directs that planning policy and decisions should aim to ensure that development functions well and adds to the overall quality of the area, establishes a strong sense of place and creates attractive and comfortable places to live, work and visit. The advice goes on to state that development should respond to local character and history and reflect local surroundings and materials. Developments should be visually attractive and result in safe and accessible environments.
- 6.32 The proposed dwellings are – like the fallback position - to be sited on the footprint of an existing house. The use of a limited palette of traditional materials and forms would give rise to a strong coherent design to reflect and respect the site and the wider context. The proposed dwellings would provide modern, attractive, flexible, and generous accommodation, a bespoke traditional design with contemporary elements. There would be no visual conflict with neighbouring houses as similar forms can be seen nearby.
- 6.33 The proposal satisfies BDP 19 in terms of design, as it will provide an improved quality of development of a design that respects the surrounding area. BDP 19.1 is of particular relevance as it encourages the use of sustainable construction methods and materials.
- 6.34 In summary, there is no conflict with the adopted BDP Policies 1, 2, 4, 19 or 21 or with the National Planning Policy Framework.

## **7. CONCLUSION**

- 7.1 The erection of two dwellings replacing one dwelling wholly accords with adopted BDP policies and with more recent national policy. Bromsgrove District Council has accepted redevelopment of this site with two houses at pre-application stage. A larger lawful scheme of poorer design and standard may be built. What is now proposed differs from the approved scheme by virtue of securing two dwellings without harm to the Green Belt. The scheme should be welcomed.
- 7.2 Replacement buildings including houses are not inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The redevelopment of previously developed land is not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided that the impact upon openness is not greater. There would be no greater impact on openness than what could be built. The 2022 approved scheme could be implemented and represents a fallback position.
- 7.3 Limited infilling also not an inappropriate use in the Green Belt.
- 7.4 There is no conflict with the five purposes of including land within the Green Belt as set out in the NPPF.
- 7.5 Whichever way you assess this application, either as infill under para 149 (e) or as a redevelopment under para 149 (g) the proposal complies with policy.
- 7.4 The proposed development would have no greater or harmful impact on local services, it could be said more housing would support local services. The proposal comprises sustainable development in accordance with NPPF requirements and the BDP. The proposed replacement dwellings would have no adverse impact upon the character or appearance of the area. No neighbours would suffer from loss of or reduced amenity or privacy.



- 7.5 The development would provide two superior efficient homes and would create an attractive, modest, and high-quality development using modern materials and treatments in a traditional style. At the same time, it would deliver higher standards in terms of energy and water efficiency than those that prevailed when The Owls Nest was first built.
- 7.6 This statement has considered and addressed all aspects of local and national planning policy and shows that proposal would fully accord with the overall objectives of those policies. The scheme has been sensitively and carefully designed to ensure that no harm would arise. Construction would employ energy efficient building techniques to achieve reduced carbon emissions.
- 7.7 In the circumstances set out above it is expected that officers will support this proposal.