

Item No. 8**SCHEDULE A**

APPLICATION NUMBER	CB/11/00974/FULL
LOCATION	Holly Cottage, Lower Rads End, Eversholt, Milton Keynes, MK17 9EE
PROPOSAL	Removal of existing two storey rear extension and flat roofed garages. Replace with two storey extension.
PARISH	Eversholt
WARD	Aspley & Harlington
WARD COUNCILLORS	Cllr Budge Wells
CASE OFFICER	Mary Collins
DATE REGISTERED	16 March 2011
EXPIRY DATE	11 May 2011
APPLICANT	Mr J Nield & Ms J Craig
AGENT	David Sim Architects
REASON FOR COMMITTEE TO DETERMINE RECOMMENDED DECISION	Councillor F Chapman called in. Requests that Councillors visit the site. There are good planning reasons for this application to be approved.
	Full Application - Refused

Recommendation

That Planning Permission be Refused for the following reasons:

- 1 The proposed extension, by nature of its size in comparison with the original dwelling, would result in a disproportionate extension in a Green Belt location where restrictive planning policies apply. The proposal therefore constitutes inappropriate development and no very special circumstances have been submitted to justify the development. The proposal is therefore contrary to Planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belt January 1995 (Amended March 2001).
- 2 The proposal due to the depth of its projection would result in an incongruous form of development that would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling; as such the proposal is contrary to Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies for Central Bedfordshire (North) and Supplementary Planning Guidance: Design Supplement 4: Residential Alterations and Extensions (2010).
- 3 The proposal would have an adverse impact on the amenities, outlook and privacy of the occupiers of nearby residential properties; as such the proposal is contrary to Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies for Central Bedfordshire (North).

Notes to Applicant

(1) In advance of the consideration of the application the Committee were advised of representations received subsequent to the despatch of the agenda from the Applicant who had brought to the attention of the Planning Officer that the plan attached to the agenda showed an incorrect outline of the application site.

(2) In advance of the consideration of the application the Committee received representations made under the Public Participation Scheme.