



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 December 2020

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06/01/2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M3645/D/20/3260041

The Standard, Brickfield Road, Outwood, Surrey RH1 5QF

- 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 James Mair against the decision of Tandridge District Council.
 - The application Ref TA/2020/816, dated 27 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 6 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey infill extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey infill extension at The Standard, Brickfield Road, Outwood, Surrey RH1 5QF in accordance with the terms of the application Ref TA/2020/816, dated 27 April 2020, 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 drawing ref. PL/01/420.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether or not the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework and any relevant development plan policies.

Reasons

3. The National Planning Policy Framework ('Framework') sets out that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. At paragraph 145 it regards the construction of new buildings as inappropriate unless, amongst other things, at c) it 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.
4. Policies DP10 and DP13 of the Tandridge Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies 2014 ('TLP') take a broadly similar approach to the Framework, although for dwellings they use a different date for assessing the 'original building'. Neither

the Framework, nor the TLP, defines what constitutes a disproportionate addition.

5. However, at paragraphs 13.3 to 13.4 the TLP states that the Council will adopt a pragmatic approach based on an application's individual merits, and with regard to factors such as bulk, height, mass and prominence; with calculations generally based on external volume rather than floor area or footprint.
6. According to the appellant, the extension would measure 2.25 x 1.75 metres. The Council calculates that the volume of the original dwelling is about 530 cubic metres. Taking account of previous additions, it states that the extension's roughly 11 cubic metres, would result in a total volume of about 884 cubic metres, or a 66.75% increase on the original building.
7. For my part I note that the extension would be very modestly proportioned. It would have a low, flat-roofed form, which would be set down well below the height of the original building, and which would match the height of an existing extension approved under planning application ref: 2016/948. It would effectively infill a very small corner of the building's footprint, without extending it further in any direction.
8. Whilst I have noted the site's planning history as set out in the officer report, I have no detailed evidence to fully assess which elements of the existing building are 'original'. However, the building's additional size as a result of this scheme would be so modest, that its impact on the Green Belt would be negligible and inconsequential.
9. Consequently, whilst I have had regard to cumulative impacts, applying a pragmatic approach, this scheme would not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. Consequently, it would not conflict with TLP Policies DP10 and DP13, or with the Framework.

Conditions and Conclusion

10. Turning to the matter of conditions, I have considered those suggested by the Council against the Framework's tests. As well as the standard time limit condition, in the interests of certainty, a condition is necessary requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plan. In the interests of the character and appearance of the property, a matching materials condition is also necessary.
11. For the above reasons, whilst having regard to cumulative impacts, the proposal would not result in a disproportionate addition to the original building. Thus, it would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is therefore allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR