



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 April 2021

by Euan FS Pearson BA(Hons) BTP FRGS MRICS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M3645/D/21/3266842

Little Cricket, Outwood Common, Outwood RH1 5PW

- 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 R Williams against the decision of Tandridge District Council.
 - The application Ref TA/2020/1786, dated 6 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 3 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is demolition of part of existing extended kitchen, construction of two storey side/rear extension, and replacement of uPVC windows with timber sash.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of part of existing extended kitchen, construction of two storey side/rear extension, and replacement of uPVC windows with timber sash at Little Cricket, Outwood Common, Outwood RH1 5PW, in accordance with the terms of application Ref TA/2020/1786, dated 6 October 2020 and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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: Location Plan, Site Plan, and Drawing Nos. 2003/A1/001 Rev P2, and 2003/A1/002 Rev P2.
 - 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 Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and any relevant development plan policies; and,
 - whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, would be clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances required to justify the proposal.

Reasons

Appropriateness of development in the Green Belt

3. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwellinghouse within Outwood Conservation Area, part of a small cluster of buildings in the Green Belt. The appeal property has been previously extended: as shown on the application drawings. However, it is not clear from the evidence before me what the size of the appeal property was on 31 December 1968, the date taken as the 'original building'.
4. It is proposed to partially demolish the single-storey extension attached to the north elevation of the appeal property and add a two-storey/upper floor extension to the south elevation. The Council considers that the development would be acceptable in design terms and would not harm either the appearance of the appeal property or the surrounding conservation area. I see no reason to disagree.
5. The proposed two storey/upper floor extension would be confined to within existing rear and south, side building lines. The ridge height would be no higher than that of the original dwellinghouse. The proposed extension with such dimensions, occupying a footprint of around 18m², is modest. Irrespective of its arithmetic volume, I consider this results in a size, mass and orientation of building not dissimilar to neighbouring properties and therefore, proportionate and acceptable.
6. The Council accepts the Appellant's volume figure, that the original dwellinghouse, about 284m³. I note that no figures have been presented having regard to the situation at the end of 1968. The proposed development would result in a net increase in volume (over the original dwellinghouse) of about 54%, according to the Council. The Appellant's figure is just under 50%. In this case, I do not consider that either would constitute such a significant increase in volume, so as to be disproportionate.
7. The Council states that it considers extensions that would result in a volume increase over 40%, would be disproportionate. That percentage figure is not contained in the Tandridge Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies 2014-2029 (Local Plan). The Council's approach, set out in paragraph 13.3 of the Local Plan, is to judge each proposal on its individual merits: as I have done. The proposed development would be of an appropriate scale and cause no harm to the openness of the area.
8. Therefore, the proposal would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, in compliance with policies DP10 and DP13 of the Local Plan and the Framework. Among other things, these require extensions to dwellings in the Green Belt not to result in disproportionate additions to the original dwellinghouse.
9. The statutory duty in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is of considerable weight and importance. This is reflected in the Framework at paragraph 193 which states that great weight should be given to the asset's conservation irrespective of the degree of harm. Having regard to the above, I conclude the proposal would preserve the character or appearance of Outwood Conservation Area.

Very special circumstances

10. I have found that the proposal would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, therefore, I do not need to consider the question of whether there are very special circumstances necessary to justify the development.

Conditions

11. I have considered the need for conditions against the advice on conditions set out in the NPPF and the Planning Practice Guidance. I have imposed standard conditions relating to the commencement of development and specifying the relevant plans in order to provide certainty. I have also included a condition requiring the external materials to match the existing dwellinghouse, to protect the character and appearance of the Green Belt and Conservation Area.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Euan FS Pearson

INSPECTOR