



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 May 2022

by C Shearing BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M3645/D/20/3261779

3 Sally's Mead, Lingfield Common Road, Lingfield, Surrey RH7 6BU

- 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 Mark Johnstone against the decision of Tandridge District Council.
 - The application Ref TA/2020/799, registered by the Council on 6 May 2020 was refused by notice dated 29 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of single storey front and side extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of single storey front and side extensions at 3 Sally's Mead, Lingfield Common Road, Lingfield, Surrey RH7 6BU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref TA/2020/799, dated 6 May 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 the following approved plans: 3/1 (Existing Plan and Elevations), 3/2 (Proposed Plan and Elevation), 3/3 (Elevations), SK01 (Building Plan).

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of the development above is taken from the Council's decision notice, which more concisely describes the proposal. The site address is taken from the application form.
3. During the course of the appeal the revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published. There are no substantive changes relevant to the appeal before me and therefore no interested parties would be prejudiced by my consideration of the 2021 version of the Framework.
4. Also during the course of the appeal, progress has been made towards the adoption of the emerging Tandridge District Council Local Plan 'Our Local Plan: 2033'. As the policies it contains have not yet been adopted, I give little weight to this document in my decision.
5. Additional supporting plans have been submitted with the appeal. These include plan SK2A which shows the locations of previously removed and approved additions to the wider site, as well as plans dated 2004. As these provide additional clarity only, and propose no changes to the development proposed, I have had regard to them in reaching my decision.

Main Issues

6. The main issues are:

- i. Whether the development is inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the Framework and any relevant development plan policies;
- ii. The effect of the development on the openness of the Green Belt;
- iii. If the development is inappropriate, whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development.

Reasons

7. The appeal site is in a rural location, set at the end of a track on the northern side of Lingfield Common Road which is shared with other properties. The appeal property is set at the southern end of the site and equestrian uses including stables, paddock and sand school, exist to the north.
8. The Framework in paragraph 137 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, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. The Framework further establishes that the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt should be regarded as inappropriate, subject to a number of exceptions as set out in paragraph 149. One such exception being 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.
9. Policies DP10 and DP13 part e) of the Tandridge Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies 2014-2019 (the LPP2) align with the objectives of the Framework in requiring that extensions do not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. The supporting text to Policy DP13 confirms that, when determining what constitutes a disproportionate addition, as well as using a calculation of external volume the Council will judge each proposal on its own merits, taking into account factors including bulk, height, mass and prominence of the extension, and impact on the openness of the Green Belt. It is notable that a fixed percentage for an acceptable volume increase is not stated, rather that the Council will adopt a pragmatic approach.
10. The Council report that the original building has already been extended in the past. There was an earlier appeal decision relating to a larger proposed extension on the site of 4 March 2004¹ and the volume figures now used by the Council are the same as those accepted by the Inspector in that decision. This states that the original dwelling comprised 322m³, and that an extension approved in 1974 had added some 139m³. These figures have not been disputed by the appellant and I find no reason to disagree with them.
11. The Council state that the development proposed would add a further 65.12m³ to the volume of the building. Together with the previous additions that the original building has experienced, this represents an uplift of over 60% in

¹ APP/M3645/A/03/1132513

volume. I do not find this to be excessive, particularly given the relatively small size of the property.

12. The proposed single storey extensions would each be modest in their footprint. They would comprise low eaves levels consistent with the main dwelling and low-level roofs with wrap-around pitches, reducing the bulk of the roof forms. The extensions would be set to the southern end the building, away from the more open areas of the site which exist to the north and east. In addition, following my site visit, I do not consider it to be evident in visual terms that the building has been disproportionately extended or is substantially departed from its original form, as suggested by the Council. Taken in combination and having regard to the considerations listed within the development plan, I am satisfied that the proposed extensions would be proportionate additions to the original dwelling.
13. Consequently, the proposal would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and it follows that the proposal would not be harmful to the openness of the Green Belt or to the purposes of including land within it. A case for very special circumstances is not therefore required.
14. The proposal complies with Policies DP10 and DP13 of the LPP2 insofar as they seek to resist inappropriate development in the Green Belt including disproportionate additions to buildings. The proposal also complies with the objectives of section 13 the Framework relating to the Green Belt.

Conditions

15. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council. In addition to the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans to provide certainty to the parties. As the supporting plans adequately describe the external materials to be used, a further condition relating to materials would not be necessary.

Conclusion

16. For the above reasons, having taken account of the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, along with all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

C Shearing

INSPECTOR