



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 24 February 2021

by Rachael Pipkin BA (Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th March 2021

Appeal A Ref: APP/Y3615/D/20/3263749

The Lodge at Barn End, The Street, West Clandon GU4 7TG

- 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 & Mrs Christian against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/P/01166, dated 14 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of rear extension to provide a second bedroom with en-suite shower room.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/Y3615/D/20/3267836

The Lodge at Barn End, The Street, West Clandon GU4 7TG

- 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 Hannah Ruding-Bryan against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/P/02064, dated 2 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 28 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of rear extension to provide a second bedroom with en-suite shower room.
-

Decision

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

3. As set out above there are two appeals on this site. The appellants for Appeal A are different to the appellant for Appeal B. However, I am satisfied that the appeals have been correctly made by the original applicants for both schemes.
4. Both appeals A and B propose a single-storey ground floor extension. They differ only in that Appeal B is reduced in size. I have considered each proposal on its individual merits. However, to avoid duplication I have dealt with the two schemes together, except where otherwise indicated.

Main Issues

5. The main issues in both appeals are:

- 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;
- the effect of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt; and
- if the proposal is inappropriate development, whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, would be clearly outweighed by other considerations. If so, would this amount to the very special circumstances required to justify the proposal.

Reasons

Whether inappropriate development in the Green Belt

6. The appeal site is located within the Metropolitan Green Belt. The construction of new buildings should be regarded as inappropriate in the Green Belt subject to a limited number of exceptions as set out in paragraph 145 of the Framework. Criteria (c) allows for 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. Neither the Framework nor the local plan define 'disproportionate'. It is assessed on a case by case basis, taking into account factors such as footprint, floorspace, volume, mass and bulk.
7. The Lodge is a modestly sized, single-storey outbuilding within a domestic garden. The proposed extension in both Appeal A and Appeal B would be single-storey with an overall height of around 3.3 metres. This would be slightly lower than the height of the existing building. In Appeal A, it would be nearly 10 metres long and a little longer than the original building. It would extend across approximately half the width of the building with a slightly tapered shape. In Appeal B it would be a little shorter and narrower but a similar length to the existing building.
8. There is some dispute between the parties regarding the floorspace of both the existing outbuilding and the proposed extension in both appeals. The appellants' calculations indicate the original outbuilding has a floorspace of 53.16 square metres. Based on the appellants' figures, the proposed extension in Appeal A would add approximately 33 square metres and in Appeal B, 25 square metres. These would increase the floorspace of the building by approximately 62 per cent and 47 per cent respectively.
9. Whilst the Council has calculated a different floorspace area, the uplift in floorspace in both appeals would be similar. Based on the Council's calculations, this would be approximately 60 per cent and 46 per cent. In both appeals, this increase would be significant, with the existing building's floorspace increased by almost half in Appeal B and more than half in Appeal A.
10. In both appeals the proposals would at least double the length of the existing building. Despite their modest height, the additional volume and bulk of the proposed extensions, taken in combination with the increased floorspace and length of the building, would amount to a disproportionate addition to the

original building. This would be the case for both appeals. The proposals would therefore not meet the exception set out in paragraph 145(c).

11. As such, the proposed extension in both Appeal A and Appeal B would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Such development would be, by definition, harmful and would be contrary to the Framework and Policy P2 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: strategy and sites 2019 (Local Plan).

Effect on the openness of the Green Belt

12. Paragraph 133 of the Framework states that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. It identifies openness as an essential characteristic of the Green Belt. Openness is the absence of development and has both spatial and visual effects.
13. In spatial terms, the proposed extension in both schemes would increase the footprint of the building and its volume. The additional footprint and volume of development would cause a loss of openness. The proposed extensions would be screened from view as they would extend rearwards of the outbuilding into the existing garden and be positioned behind a tall coniferous hedge along the garden boundary. As such the visual consequences of that loss of openness would be minimal.
14. I conclude that the appeal proposals would result in a small loss of openness thereby causing limited harm to the Green Belt. Therefore, it would be contrary to the objectives of the Framework.

Other considerations

15. The appellants have not identified any other considerations to justify the proposed development.

The Green Belt Balance

16. I have concluded that the proposals would be inappropriate development and would therefore, by definition, be harmful to the Green Belt. I have also found that they would cause limited harm to the openness of the Green Belt. These are matters to which I give substantial weight as required by paragraph 144 of the Framework.
17. There are no other considerations in favour of the proposals that clearly outweigh the harm I have identified. Consequently, the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development in Appeal A and Appeal B do not exist.
18. As such the proposed schemes would be contrary to the Framework. They would also conflict with Policy P2 of the Local Plan which set out that the Green Belt should be protected against inappropriate development.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that both Appeal A and Appeal B should be dismissed.

Rachael Pipkin

INSPECTOR