
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 October 2017

by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 23 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/D3640/D/17/3181387

Oakdene, Stafford Lake, Bisley, Surrey, GU24 9AY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr P Raynes against the decision of Surrey Heath Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 17/0415, dated 2 May 2017, was refused by notice dated 29 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey rear extension at Oakdene, Stafford Lake, Bisley, Surrey, GU24 9AY, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 17/0415, dated 2 May 2017, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: FL1609-1, FL1609-2.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building.

Main issues

2. I consider that the main issues in this case are a) whether the proposal constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt, b) if it is inappropriate development, its effect on the openness of the Green Belt, c) its effect on the character and appearance of the area, and d) whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development.

Reasons

3. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) sets out several categories of new buildings which are not inappropriate development in the Green Belt. It allows for the extension or alteration of an existing building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. It states that the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and permanence.

4. The Council has not put forward any policy relating to development proposals in the Green Belt. I have therefore determined the appeal in accordance with the Framework. This does not provide any direction as to what may be regarded as a disproportionate addition, nor does it indicate how this should be measured, for example, by floor space or volume.
5. The appeal property is a replacement detached chalet bungalow permitted in 1979. Permitted development rights were removed as part of that permission. The Council states that subsequent extensions to the front, rear and side have resulted in an increase over the original dwelling of 40.9% and that the proposed extension of 10sqm would bring the cumulative increase over the original dwelling to 49%. The extensions were permitted in 2011 in the context of PPG2 *Green Belts*, which also did not specify any figure as to what amounted to a disproportionate addition. PPG2 was superseded by the Framework.
6. In my opinion, relying solely on floor space as a means by which to judge whether an addition is disproportionate has limitations in that it takes no account of height, volume or bulk. I consider that the proposed extension would be very modest in size, not only in terms of its floor space, but also insofar as it would not add significantly to the overall volume of the dwelling.
7. It would project approximately 2m from the original rear wall of the dwelling with its rear wall in line with that of the permitted rear extension. It would have a low profile hipped roof with the same eaves height as the existing. It would integrate well with the existing house and I consider that it would not be a disproportionate addition to the dwelling either in its own right or in terms of its cumulative effect taken with the previous extensions.
8. I conclude that the proposal would not be inappropriate development and that it would be consistent with the Framework.
9. The appeal property is one of a small isolated group of detached dwellings in a rural area. The dwellings are mixed in style and form. The proposal would reflect the design characteristics of the original dwelling, be constructed of similar materials and be unobtrusive in the landscape due to its location to the rear of the building and the screen provided by mature trees and other vegetation. I conclude that it would not harm the character and appearance of the building itself or the surrounding area. It would be consistent with policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 which requires development to be of high quality design.
10. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

Conditions

11. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council, having regard to the tests set out in the Framework. A condition detailing the plans is necessary to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and for the avoidance of doubt. A condition relating to the materials is necessary in order to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR