
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 January 2021

by Sian Griffiths BSc(Hons) DipTP MScRealEst MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R3650/D/20/3261548

2 Turners Mead, Chiddingfold, Godalming GU8 4UD

- 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 John James against the decision of Waverley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref WA/2020/1262, dated 14 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 16 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of two storey extension and porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of two storey extension and porch at 2 Turners Mead, Chiddingfold, Godalming GU8 4UD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref WA/2020/1262, dated 14 July 2020 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: House and Land Plan; Location and Block Plan (FAS/TM/01); Existing Plan and Elevations (FAS/TM/02); Proposed Plan (FAS/TM/03).

Preliminary Matters

2. During the determination of the application, the council changed the description of development which was broadened to include the proposed enclosed porch. I have therefore used this description for the purposes of precision.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - Whether or not the proposals would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, having regard to the Framework and relevant development plan policies;
 - The effect on the openness of the Green Belt;
 - Whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, would be clearly outweighed by other considerations. If so, whether this would

amount to the very special circumstances required to justify the proposal (the Green Belt balance).

Reasons

Whether the proposals would be inappropriate development

4. Turners Mead is a cul-de-sac situated in the southern edge of the rural village of Chiddingfold, which is 'washed over' by Green Belt and situated within the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The appeal site is an unlisted, semi-detached, two storey dwelling situated at the front of the cul-de-sac, in a generous plot. At the site visit, I observed that a number of dwellings along Turners Mead had been enlarged with side extensions.
5. Paragraph 143 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (NPPF) states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.
6. Paragraph 145 of the Framework states that '*A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt*'. A series of exceptions to this are listed within the same paragraph. Exception 145(d) relating to extensions is relevant, '*provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building*'.
7. I note the council's calculation that the side extension and porch, taken together, would result in a 69% increase in floorspace above the original dwelling. Policy RE2 (Green Belt) of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2018 (Part 1) (LP) reflects the requirements of the Framework, as already discussed, and I note that there are no provisions within that policy setting out what may be considered as 'disproportionate', nor does there appear to be a ceiling on the overall level of development permitted as part of a domestic extension.
8. To that end, I have considered the proposals on their own merits, in light of the other matters discussed in the officer's report. In that respect, I am aware that the council did not refuse the application on the grounds of harm to character and appearance, harm to the AONB, nor harm to living conditions of existing neighbours or future occupiers.
9. Whilst the extension would be significant, adding a bedroom and living room to the existing house, given the existence of similar side extensions to other dwellings within the cul-de-sac and the subservient design, I do not consider the proposals would be disproportionate in this instance.
10. I therefore do not consider the proposals would constitute inappropriate development in the green belt and would accord with Policy RE2 and the relevant parts of the Framework.
11. In terms of the impact on openness, in light of my conclusion above, the appeal proposals would, by definition, not have an adverse impact on the openness of the Green Belt or the purposes of including land within it. As I have found that the proposals would not amount to inappropriate development, there is no requirement to assess whether there would be other considerations that amount to very special circumstances.

Conditions

12. I have applied both conditions 1 and 2 for the purposes of precision and certainty.

Conclusions

13. For the reasons given, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed, subject to the conditions listed.

Sian Griffiths

INSPECTOR