



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 July 2019

by Michael Evans BA MA MPhil DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/L3625/D/19/3227758

2 Brickfield Cottages, Ironsbottom RH2 8PP

- 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 Paul Jarrett against the decision of Reigate and Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00307/HHOLD, dated 12 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a glass walled room to link the house to the existing outbuilding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a glass walled room to link the house to the existing outbuilding, at 2 Brickfield Cottages, Ironsbottom RH2 8PP, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/00307/HHOLD, dated 12 February 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: J003128-DD01, J003128-DD02, J003128-DD03, J003128-DD04, J003128-DD05, J003128-DD06, J003128-DD07 and J003128-DD08.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed entirely of the materials specified in the application.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is whether the proposed development amounts to inappropriate development in the Green Belt for the purposes of the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) and the development plan.

Reasons

3. The appeal concerns a dwelling located within the Green Belt where Government policy in the Framework identifies development that would not be inappropriate. The extension or alteration of a building is not inappropriate provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. Reigate and Banstead Borough Local Plan

2005, policies Ho24A and Co1 and Core Strategy Policy CS3 closely reflect Government policy with which they are therefore consistent.

4. Permission was previously granted for a detached garage, which the Council considered as an extension because of its proximity to the host dwelling. Further permission was granted for its use as habitable space. It is shown on the submitted plans to currently comprise a gym/playroom and would become a living room. The Council provides figures relating to the cumulative increase in floor area and volume deriving from the combined impact of the outbuilding and the proposed extension. Nevertheless, the question of proportionality concerns overall size and volume is a more precise reflection of this than floor area.
5. The Council indicates that the extension linking the converted outbuilding to the house would result in a cumulative increase in built volume of 49% over that of the original building. Neither the Framework nor the development plan policies set a specific limit or threshold for such size increases. Moreover, I see no reason why an increase of 49% should, in itself, be considered to constitute an increase of such an extent as to be disproportionate. In these circumstances this matter must be a question of judgement and the amplification to Policy Ho24A indicates that regard should be had to the form, bulk and height of the proposal in comparison to the original dwelling.
6. The detached outbuilding is separated from the host dwelling by a fairly modest gap, which would be infilled by the proposed extension. The combined width of the extension and detached outbuilding would fairly modestly exceed that of the host dwelling, which comprises the original building. The cumulative footprint would comprise a fairly high proportion of that of the original building.
7. However, the detached structure does not project beyond the front building line and extends a noticeably lesser distance to the rear than the host dwelling. Moreover, the extension would be set back from the front and rear of both the attached buildings. The addition would not result in any increase in the extent of development across the site given its position between buildings, with it also projecting no further to the front or rear.
8. Furthermore, the ridge of the detached outbuilding is significantly below that of the fairly imposing two storey semi-detached host property and its eaves are also noticeably lower, with these factors significantly limiting its bulk. Because of its flat roof form and fairly modest single storey height, the link extension would be even lower with its top not rising above the eaves of the detached outbuilding. In consequence, the height and additional bulk of the extension would be particularly modest and limited. Even when considered together, because of factors such as their fairly compact footprint and single storey height, the extension and outbuilding would be subordinate to the original building.
9. In these circumstances, matters such as the cumulative width, footprint and additional built volume and size of the extension and linked outbuilding would not be excessive, with the scheme not resulting in disproportionate additions to the original building. It is, therefore, concluded that the proposal would not comprise inappropriate development in the Green Belt. In consequence, there would be compliance with policies in the Framework and development plan concerning development in the Green Belt.

10. The Parish Council has expressed concern that the flat roof is out of character with the existing building. This form would contrast with the adjacent pitched roof buildings. However, it is acceptable given the linking function and highly subordinate size and bulk, together with the lightweight largely glazed character of the extension.
11. Taking account of all other matters raised, because of the acceptability in relation to Green Belt Policy it is determined that the appeal succeeds.
12. A condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is necessary to provide certainty. The facing materials used in the development should be as specified in the application in order to ensure a satisfactory appearance.

M Evans

INSPECTOR