
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 November 2020

by S Leonard BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/20/3258091

Lynsted, Clandon Road, West Clandon GU4 7UW

- 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 Simon Chambers against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/P/00837, dated 19 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 9 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of detached garage/carport.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of detached garage/carport at Lynsted, Clandon Road, West Clandon GU4 7UW in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 20/P/00837, dated 19 May 2020, 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: A101, A102 and A103.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and any relevant development plan policies.

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a large, detached, two storey dwelling which forms part of a loose-knit line of dwellings on the west side of Clandon Road. It lies outside of any defined settlement boundary and within the Green Belt. The proposal is a detached timber-framed garage/carport, which would be sited on an area of grass to the front of the house.
4. The Framework identifies that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. It goes on to state that inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. In addition, the construction of new buildings should be regarded as inappropriate in the Green Belt subject to a number of exceptions as set out in Paragraph 145. Policy P2 of the *Guildford*

Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2019 (LPSS) echoes national policy concerning inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

5. One of the exceptions listed in Paragraph 145 of the Framework is "*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*" (Paragraph 145 c). The Council considers that the proposal is a new structure separate from the main dwelling, and that outbuildings are not considered to comprise an extension to the main dwelling for the purposes of Green Belt policy and should be treated as entirely new buildings.
6. Neither national or local policy make any specific reference to outbuildings or other ancillary domestic buildings as not being inappropriate development within the Green Belt. However, the appellant claims that a detached domestic outbuilding could be regarded as part of the dwelling, and that for the purposes of planning policy, garages or domestic outbuildings are to be considered as an extension to the dwelling. Reflecting the approach identified in *Sevenoaks District Council v SSE and Dawe [1997]*, the appellant claims that the proposed garage/carport would not be inappropriate development within the Green Belt because it should be regarded as a normal domestic adjunct, or extension, to the host dwelling, and it would not be disproportionate in relation to the size of the original dwelling.
7. Whether the erection of a garage/carport should be considered a normal domestic adjunct to the dwelling on the appeal site is a matter of fact and degree for the decision maker to assess. I concur with the appellant in respect of this matter, since the proposed building would be sited within the existing residential curtilage of the property, and would be positioned close to the house and an existing on-site parking area, and would be directly associated with both in terms of its use. It would also be accessed via the existing site vehicular access.
8. Taking account of its function, the immediate proximity to Lynsted and the clear and direct relationship with the main house, the proposed garage/carport can reasonably be treated as an extension when applying Green Belt policies.
9. Having regard to extensions to buildings, Policy P2 of the LPSS confirms that the "*original building*" shall mean either: a) the building as it existed on 1 July 1948; or b) if no building existed on 1 July 1948, then the first building as it was originally built after this date. Policy P2 contains no detailed guidance about the approach that the Council will take in considering whether or not an extension is 'disproportionate'.
10. The evidence before me is that the original dwelling has been extended by virtue of a part single and part two storey addition, following demolition of a garage and outbuildings, that resulted in a 22% increase in floorspace, under planning application Ref 11/P/02215, which was allowed at appeal. The appeal Inspector considered that this did not represent a disproportionate addition to the original dwelling.
11. Based on the appellant's calculations, the proposed garage/carport would have a floor area of about 28 sq m, which would amount to a 29% increase in the floorspace of the original dwelling. Based on the evidence before me, I have no reason to dispute these figures. The building would have a pitched roof, but its scale would be modest when compared to the form, bulk and height of the

large main house. Taking these factors together, I find that the proposal would not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling.

12. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would not be inappropriate development within the Green Belt, having regard to Policy P2 of the LPSS and the Framework.

Conditions

13. A condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is necessary to provide certainty.

Conclusion

14. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

S Leonard

INSPECTOR